

VOL. L.

No. 178

# The Church Review

EDITED BY THE  
Rev. Henry Mason Baum

SEPTEMBER, 1887

## CONTENTS

1. THE PRINCIPLES OF ART. <i>Prof. J. M. Haffan, D. D.</i> . . .	257
2. SHAKESPEARIAN ENGLISH AND THE PRAYER BOOK. <i>Alston Morgan, Esq.</i> . . .	270
3. THE CHURCH AND THE KIRK OF SCOTLAND. <i>Prof. Knut Nelson, D. D.</i> . . .	283
4. THE SCOTTISH KIRK AND THE VOICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON EPISCOPAL ORDINATION. <i>Rev. Arthur Lowndes, M. A.</i> . . .	296
5. THE LIFE, TIMES, AND CORRESPONDENCE OF BISHOP WHITE. Chapter V. Measures for Organization. <i>Rev. William Stevens Perry, D. D., LL. D.</i> . . .	320
6. THE FIRST BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA. ( <i>Concluded.</i> ) Chapter V. The First Colonial Episcopate. <i>Rt. Rev. William Stevens Perry, D. D., LL. D.</i> . . .	343
7. THE LAW OF THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. Chapter V. Genesis of the Constitution. <i>Rev. Henry Mason Baum</i> . . .	364
8. AMERICAN CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE . . .	371
9. GERMAN CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE . . .	379

NEW YORK  
J. G. GEDDES AND COMPANY  
Printers of the University Press, Cambridge  
LONDON: WELLS GARDNER, DARTON & CO

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00

SINGLE NUMBER, 35 CENTS

## APPENDIX

...ing to ... have become the publishers ...  
... (Harry) ... with the cooperation of his friends,  
... to extend ... usefulness. With the  
... of ... in this country there should be a  
... standing ... of Clergymen and Lay-  
... created ... so truly representative of her  
... might and ...

... and already ... the names of most of  
... and laymen, and its presence in any  
... must ... indicate an appreciation of some  
... higher than ... superficial content of the daily  
... newspaper ...

... it was ... 1848, nearly every man of literary  
... in ... has been a contributor to its pages.  
... a fact ... be ignored by those who would be  
... with ... and religious culture of the Church.

... also ... the readers of the Review that we  
... made ... selecting Sunday School  
... and ... for American and foreign books  
... qualification ... please attention to any orders  
... and to use ...

... & COMPANY,

... and ...

... 133 South Street

NEW YORK

# THE CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. L.—SEPTEMBER, 1887.—No. CLXXVI.

---

## PRINCIPLES OF ART.

*Principles of Art.* By JOHN C. VAN DYKE, Librarian of the Sage Library, New Brunswick, N. J. New York: Fords, Howard & Hulbert. 1887.

In the estimation in which art is held, there has been of late a change with us as also in England where the prosaic level of thought is stirred; while on the contrary, in Germany, art has been a recognised factor of intellectual life, certainly since the days of Lessing and Goethe, making itself felt in literature, philosophy, and all the higher forms of social living. Whether arising from a sense of the money value of art-works stimulating their production for the market, or some less selfish cause, art-studies are far more in vogue than formerly. Time was, and not long ago, when even among educated people the question was scornfully asked, What is art? Now art has gained admission into the circle of the recognised humanities. It ranks with literature and science. Our schools are incomplete without instruction in this branch, and it is expected of cultivated persons that they should possess some knowledge of art,—should be able to speak of the Renaissance and have a vague idea at least of the distinction between the Romanesque and the Gothic. Writers find it quite the thing to embroider their essays with art illustrations, and preachers their discourses. While there are groups among us not untouched by æsthetic culture, and while there is wholesome activity in many directions, as in wood-engraving, wood-carving, pottery, glass-painting, and the decorative arts, it may be doubted whether there is a love of art beyond this decorative stage; but this is a beginning, and

---

Copyright, 1887, by HENRY MASON BAUM.

the ornamental idea is entering fast enough into the surroundings of our lives, to add grace to every bit of furniture, and rug on the hearth and plate on the table, and I do not know why we should quarrel with the diffusion of taste in such things ; yet as representing art, this goes only a small way. We have, too, artists of conspicuous talent, if not constituting an original school ; but the mind of the country (how could it be otherwise ?) is not in its art. Its labor is still in the rough, and in industrial pursuits. Art demands the severest labor, but it also demands the labor of love. It is a product of the loving study of nature. When a nation loves art its whole mental force goes into it. The people who produced the mediæval sculptures loved nature, as is proved by every carven leaf and tendril, and they must have regarded with delight the variety of nature's objects and their curious combinations as they walked through the fields and vineyards, mingling them with human faces of celestial innocence. They had thoughts of rarer things playing into their minds. The exquisite intagli of the Church of San Agostino at Perugia were created as spontaneously as the flowers. Men found relief from the tyrannies of iron-handed governments and the terrors of political factions in these objects of the imagination. In the streets of Orvieto, Nuremberg, Chartres, Rheims, the people doubtless stopped to study the rich recessed doorways of the cathedrals, just as the citizens of Athens turned aside from their daily avocations to gaze with silent joy on the sculptures at the entrance of the Acropolis, as if these were nothing so strange after all, for they themselves felt the same love of beauty and inspiration out of which they sprang. While the sight touched something responsive they were made nobler by it, for how great a privilege for a people to be able to see every day the most beautiful things ! But this does not happen at once. Perfection comes through imperfection. There was a vast deal anterior to the perfection of Greek art, of the unskilled effort of ages following crude ideas and false types ; yet Greek art, though it has its incomplete periods, represents the development rather than the beginning of the artistic impulse in the world ; it marks the period of organised and perfected art.

The history of art, which, a century since, was a confused field with immense unknown tracts, is now tolerably well explored and reduced to definite bounds, though much remains to

be cleared up in the evolution of the art-instinct in civilisation. Historic art like historic science "consists in the making of distinctions ; and its primary distinctions are those of time and space," comparing decade with decade, century with century, and even a hundred centuries with a hundred centuries, and then the steps of progress begin to be discovered and nothing of existent art — no fragment — is without significance. It will not be necessary to follow this history, as Mr. Van Dyke has done so clearly and compactly, although his three grand historic divisions in the evolution of art I should not be inclined to accept, since, for example, the "ideal" rather than the "imitative" predominated in a great portion of Egyptian art, and the "intellectual" and "individual," which he makes the characteristics of modern art, were eminently the qualities of Greek art ; but our present object is to search for underlying principles.

It is impossible to give any rigid definition of art. It bursts from our formulas like an uncontrolled spring. It is indefinable because it is a truth rather than a term ; yet we may do something toward a definition by separating art from truths akin to it. Art, for example, is not nature, while it is nothing without nature. Nature, in a general way, is all that is not art, — all that is created, not made. Nature is the substance, physical and spiritual, out of whose depths art arises like an exhalation of beauty. It comprises the forces at work to produce the phenomena of the world and their laws outside of human agency. Those phenomena in ourselves and the world "which we do not originate, but find," represent nature ; those "which we do not find, but originate," represent art. Thus the human element comes into art, while nature is purely Divine. Art, too, is not science. Science concerns itself simply with knowledge and the investigation of truth, and it may be said to be the soul's law of knowing. It deals with the facts of the universe, its chief instrument being the reason whose special function is to seek for the causes of things. Art also has to do with knowledge, for art may aid in the search after truth ; but it does not end in knowing. It is, in fact, a science, as far as its technique is concerned, and it applies science to its own methods, but its end is farther on in the perfect and joy-giving work, rather than in the scientific knowledge or technical process. Art, in like manner, is not philosophy, nor religion,

nor morality ; and it does not pretend to overtop, oppose, usurp, or meddle with these while keeping to its own sphere ; and much confusion has been caused (and no one has done more of this than Mr. Ruskin) by mixing these ; but the difference in such cases is obvious. Art, however, is no negative thing, but is a most objective reality, in that it implies the existence of natural material upon which to work, and from which to create results, requiring, however, a subjective principle of thought that orders nature for its conscious ends. In every work of art, its original material of nature, the subjective idea which calls it forth and the form which is complete in itself like a natural creation are comprehended. This applies to all forms of art, even the most mechanical. At first the term doubtless meant the arts of bare existence, the "coarse arts," as Mr. Emerson calls them, — so that the useful was its foundation idea ; and, indeed, what is not intrinsically useful is worthless in art, in the highest art itself which belongs to the highest needs of our being, and compared with which its commoner uses are as earth and clay. But as new methods of civilisation arose, art came up into these more purely intellectual and spiritual spheres. Nature was studied ; her subtle laws of working were lovingly observed ; finer natures were touched to finer issues ; and the arts which have in them a thoughtful element succeeded the arts of mere existence, until "art" won a peculiar meaning, limited to the production which has in it the love of perfect creation, of beauty, which Plato says is at once the most manifest and desirable of things. But while the artist represents the beautiful object he sees in his mind's eye, and paints from his mind's eye, art is never simply a mental act. "The art-idea is not a mere conception, — *ist niemals ein Begriff*, — inasmuch as the latter is a frame into which different phenomena may fit, whereas the artistic idea must stand in the most intimate agreement with the particular form of the work." In fine, the subject must be conceived in the object, there must be the representation of the idea which is its expression (in Mr. Van Dyke's theory the whole of art), and which expression must accompany conception. Expression reveals the artist, and indeed is another word for his art ; for if it be true that

Many are the poets sown by nature,  
Yet wanting the accomplishment of verse,

it can hardly be said that the power of vision in the artist is

ever unaccompanied by the power of expression, though the two may be unequally distributed. The bas-reliefs on the pediment of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, which Pausanias ascribes to the Attic sculptors Alkamenes and Paionios, are conceived with the utmost dramatic power, but are stiffly executed: probably the conception was that of the great artist, and the work that of the local artist. Art, therefore, if we should attempt to define the indefinable, might at least be described, in its works, as the power of creating the representation in reality of the form represented in the mind, or, more specifically, in the imagination, which is awakened to act by its sympathy with nature in all her forms, but particularly with what is perfect and beautiful.

1. Art, then, has its foundation in an inner susceptibility that corresponds to outward forms. There is a power of receiving impression corresponding to the power that impresses. There is more than this. The mind contains the ideas in their conceptual mould in which the forms of natural objects are cast, and is thus fitted to comprehend them, so that art is the condition under which the sensibility for impression is excited, when the object and subject become identified. The German writer Lotze, indeed, says that "the impression of beauty cannot be referred to a uniform standard in us, to a spiritual organisation actually existing in all individuals, but to one that has first to be realised in each person by means of development, and realised in each only in an imperfect and one-sided way;" but though it may be true that the perfect standard is not developed in every mind, or in the artist himself, yet this does not militate against the truth that there is an ideal condition, like the plate delicately prepared to receive impressions of objects, and without which the actualisation of any form of beauty would be lost, and objects would remain without form and void. A mountain is a huge pile of rocky matter until thoughts of majesty, unity, power, are actualised in its impingement upon the ideal sense. We are enframed in the material kosmos as an organism itself Divinely designed, through which the soul realises its ideas, and without which it could not formulate them, — and this is the important part nature plays in art. So, too, the ethical sense is a permanent condition of the soul, but the ideas of justice, right, duty, are not developed except in the actual relations of life.

Call the beautiful an intuition or not, man has an æsthetic sense, the outcome of whose formulated ideas is art, and which is capable of recognising and expressing the objective beauty of the universe. We are subjects of impressions which do not always find expression, and only do so when they impress with sufficient force to form clear and distinct conceptions. We, it is true, may sometimes feign an enjoyment of nature that we do not feel. There is an æsthetic cant as nauseating as any other cant. The first hunter who saw Niagara was doubtless overpowered by its sublimity, but, it may be, his mind soon recovered its accustomed apathy, and he saw nothing in the stupendous phenomenon to give him delight, and he made his preparations to cook his dinner on the edge of the cataract as coolly as ever. With an Audubon it would have been different.

If the eye had not been sunny  
How could it look upon the sun ?

I have, however, guarded against the theory that art exists solely in the mind, and that there is no intrinsic beauty in natural objects but what the mind creates in them.

2. Art is the interpretation of the significance and perfection of nature. The product of the subjective capacity when drawn forth by the beauty of nature becomes the language of art. Some think of nature only for scientific and practical uses, but "nature has two revelations, — that of use and that of beauty. The beauty is just as much a part of nature as the use ; they are only different aspects of the self-same facts, the usefulness on one side is on the other beauty. The colors of the landscape, the tints of spring and autumn, the lines of twilight and the dawn, — all that might seem the superfluity of nature, — are only her most necessary operations under another view ; her ornament is another aspect of her work ; and, in the act of laboring as a machine, she also sleeps as a picture. The same lines which serve as the measure of distance to regulate all our motions also make the beauty of perspective."\* But beyond this, it is my belief that there is actual contrivance in nature for an appeal to the æsthetic sense. Mountains that surround a valley "like a chorus of hills," by their fusion of noblest forms with finest tints, speak directly to the mind, as do the powerful words of a chorus in a Greek

\* Canon Mozley.

drama; and there is found also in nature every secret, even the subtlest, for the result of beauty, so as to produce the effect of beauty and power on the mind of the beholder. This is nature's art. What Venetian blue is like the blue of the Rosenloui glacier? What painting ever excelled the splendors of

The fiery noon, and eve's one star?

He who begins to study nature; who observes trees or a single leaf; who looks closely at the minute grass-spires under his feet that cover the whole earth; who notices the tricky play of light and shadow; who watches the sky, "sometimes gentle, sometimes capricious, sometimes awful, never the same for two moments together; almost human in its passions, almost spiritual in its tenderness, almost Divine in its infinity;" he must believe that there is that in nature which is designed to convey thoughts to the human soul far beyond those of mere sense. Art interprets this higher truth. Henri Taine says that the aim of art is "to manifest the essence of things." Art, indeed, seeks for the means of highest effects. It depends on a penetrative study of nature's principles, and here it still may be original. Here the Yankee artist has as good a chance as the Greek. Here American art may, in the future, prove its claim to originality as truly as the Dutch school has done in the past. The artist, to be an interpreter, must have knowledge, whether gained by study or instinct. He goes patiently and lovingly where nature leads him, and enters this kingdom of art by being a little child, until, through long discipline, he sees "the most essential quality of things," he grows into such intimacy with nature that he comes to interpret the thoughts of nature, and also the thoughts of the human heart. The great group of the "Niobe" came out of the profoundest depths of human experience,—there is nothing more suggestive than this sculpture in Modern Art,—as the Greek poet, Meleager, in his poem on the "Niobe," believed and proved this. There is a fragment of the Reformation in the works of that satiric, keen-eyed humorist, Holbein. There is much of the splendid but corrupt sensuousness of the Renaissance period, under the cover of Christian forms of humanity, represented in Titian's voluptuous pictures. Art is a true reflection of life, and of the life of the human soul.

3. Art finds its laws primarily in nature. It cannot go a step

independently of these and remain art. There is, for instance, the great fundamental law of Truth, which involves the idea upon which the universe itself was built. There must be a sensitive relation in the artist's mind to this law, without which art is a mere artifice, or sham. But art, as has been said, is not nature itself, nor does the artist, in Coleridge's words, "pick nature's pockets." Nature is inimitable; for how can a little square of painted canvas convey the infinitude of mountain scenery, where power is revealed like Divine inspiration? Yet nature in her commoner moods, if still inimitable, is genial and accessible. She is odd and humorous at times, with a fancifulness full of the most grotesque irony. She does not hide her winsome face. She invites us to sit at her feet. She will herself teach us. We cannot follow her instructions too closely, nor intimate her too minutely. Not a leaf but is a map of the boldest and most complicate pattern. Nature furnished the originals of Greek forms of every sort. But the artist must go beneath the surface of things to the plastic law of these forms, else imitation would be untrue. He must discover, as it were, nature's own law of creation. A picture is an illusion, but it is not a delusion, for its end is not imitation, which would be something unreal and an absurdity, but it is the production of similar effects of nature's beauty and power, so as to speak to the mind in some sense as nature speaks. While the artist is not to leave nature and lapse into a dreamland of his own, while he is to seek truth, yet by his thought, by separating the natural object from its accidental circumstances and conceiving it as a whole, by so painting the tree, the flower, the man, that the true form is seen, that the type is brought out in which the properties of the species are developed and in which it is best fitted to discharge the functions for which it was made,—this shows the highest skill; for here is the action of the artist's soul which gives to his works the appearance of fresh creations. This is the *ideal* in art. This ideal law of mental selection probably was coeval with the law of imitation, and accompanied the earliest art. No art, even the most archaic, could have been entirely imitative. "In the effort to imitate the human figure the process of thought and sympathy becomes apparent; and where this process of controlling power begins, there the ideal in art begins. Whenever this isolated portion, or scene, or action of nature is taken, it cannot be truly represented unless,

by an act of thought, it is connected with the whole. The idea, or the whole to which it belongs as a part, must enter into it and transfuse it."\* Yet be it noted that the ideal does not exist without the real, passing into it like a spirit, even as mind works on facts and moulds them. The real is the basis of the ideal. The poetic superstructure is grounded deep down in the soil of nature. "The beautiful in the real," was the Florentine sculptor Duprè's motto. Imitation, therefore, is not the object of art, or is, at best, but a very low ideal of it. Yet how can a picture, or sculpture, be too true to nature? Were the best Greek sculptures? You may be sure that it was not the close imitation only in the familiar story of the grapes that made the birds peck at them, but it was chiefly the truth. It was the real life of natural objects that the artist had caught. It was a picture, not a copy. A portrait; — what is it worth if it be not real and rugged as life is? This is the foundation of all artistic excellence. "The more nearly and truly a picture approaches the exact colors and forms of nature, the greater will be the effect." The healthy tendency of art, then, is to become more and more real, which is in the true line of progress. The vigorous revival of art in the Netherlands in the first half of the seventeenth century, which created the great Flemish and Dutch schools, to which the names of Rembrandt, Frans Hals, Terburg, Jan Steen, Ruysdael, belong, was nothing more than a return to realistic art from the feeble classic idealism and conventionalism of Italian Renaissance art. Yet rashness in theory makes a one-sided development, and the attitude of the artistic mind should be ever that of a thoughtful receptivity. All great painters have been realistic painters, but that is not all that they were. Velasquez did not paint the mere architecture of a face, but its character, its real character, drawn from a creative conception of the man. So art must continue to have in it these two elements of the real and ideal, or it will run into something analogous to that bold realism in literature which is threatening its finer life, or to that weakly subjective school of poets illustrated by Dante Gabriel Rossetti, charming as it is, but neither of them complete in itself. Art would finally run out, since some essential ingredient of life would be lost. It would either drop the element of truth to nature or the element of thought. The canons of universal art must not be

\* A. S. Murray, *History of Greek Sculpture*, p. 7.

swamped in the turbid deluge of French impressionism. Art has a rational and spiritual as well as a technical side, allying it with poetry, with the highest achievements of the human mind. The innate sensitiveness of the Greek mind to *beauty* made Greek art differ from Egyptian, Oriental, Roman, and every other form, and in this consisted the unequalled artistic genius of the Greeks; but the Greek sense of beauty was chiefly, after all, an intellectual quality of an intellectual people. Even the sensual, strong in the Greek, was subordinated to the mental in this finely attempered and gifted race. "It has been said that the Greeks worshipped only beauty; that they cultivated morality from the æsthetic side; that virtue was with them a question not of duty but a task; and many texts might be quoted to support this. We find Isocrates saying, in his encomium on Helen, that beauty is the first of all things in majesty, honor, and divineness, and that admiration for virtue itself comes to this, that of all manifestations of life, virtue is the most beautiful. Aristotle distinguishes the highest courage as willingness to die for the beautiful, which certainly did not mean mere bodily beauty. So also Plato describes philosophy as a love that leads one from fair forms to fair practices, and from fair practices to fair notions, until from fair notions he arrives at the notion of absolute beauty, and at last knows what the essence of beauty is. And this is that life beyond all others which man should live, in contemplation of beauty absolute. While loveliness has been worshipped by many others, none have conceived it under a form so worthy of worship as the Greeks. Beauty with them was neither little nor voluptuous; the soul's energies were not relaxed, but exalted by its contemplation. It was the information of matter by mind. Therefore what a Greek worshipped was the perpetual and ever-present energising of mind; but he forgot that beauty can only exist in a combination of spirit with sense; and after detaching the higher element, he continued to call it by name and clothe it in attributes proper to its earthly manifestations alone. Yet such an extension of the æsthetic sentiment involved no weakening of the moral fibre. A service comprehending all idealisms in one, demanding the self-effacement of a laborious preparation and the self-restraint of a gradual achievement. They who pitched the goal of their aspiration so high knew that the paths leading up to it were rough, steep, and long; they felt that perfect work-

manship and perfect taste, being supremely precious, must be supremely difficult as well; χαλεπὸν τὸ καλόν, they said, the beautiful is hard to win and hard to keep." \* Thus beauty with the Greeks was mainly in the perfect idea of mind and not a sensuous decoration; it was self-development, the working out of a deeper inner principle, which made their art so noble. It is this by which in the presence of their serious sculptures our spirits grow calm, and we feel the truth and moral power of the Greek conception of beauty, raising us above our littleness into a region of higher thought and feeling.

So there are other principles of nature, besides truth, which enter into art, such as unity, or that consistency of parts with the whole which gives us delight in any beautiful object; proportion, which is the outcome of symmetric mind; grace, which flows from inward sympathy and freedom; character, or individuality, or expression, so variously named, which, indeed, is very much the same as ideality, by which the artist expresses his own thought, and by which also a distinctive spirit of the period and history of the work is stamped on it; and not to mention more of these laws, above all, the law of form, to which everything in art comes, which is the highest intellectual expression of art, so that sculpture is the purest art-manifestation. By studying these laws we come, too, at the principles of art-criticism, and through the ignorance of which there is such lamentable judgment in matters of art, betokening entirely false standards drawn from metaphysics or political economy rather than from nature, and making to be measures such qualities as cost, difficulty, prettiness, melodramatic effect, bulk, warm coloring, and appeal to the sensuous, elaborate though senseless detail, instead of the true standards of nature, by a return to which through the clear instinct of æsthetic genius, lies the only road to reform and advancement.

4. Art in its final source is Divine. Beauty exists absolutely in the Divine mind, so that it is not exclusively a product of human thought. The sensualisation of art goes beyond the truth of that æsthetic sensibility which lies partly in the sphere of the senses, and it forgets the deeper source of the spiritual, which makes the artist the priest of Divine things, of that moral beauty of which Christianity is the highest expression.

Looking at these four principles, that art has its foundation

\* *Westminster Review.*

in an innate susceptibility which corresponds to outward forms ; that art is the interpretation of the significance and perfection of nature ; that art finds its laws primarily in nature ; and that art in its final source is Divine ; we may judge somewhat, from these rough pillars, what is the vast scope of art, how it reaches into the heavens as well as makes our own thought higher, our life sweeter, and this earth lovelier.

The classification of art would bring out still further its principles ; for each of the forms of art is grounded on some reason in the mental constitution, and depends originally upon the nature of the idea which strives for representation, so that every art has a body, as it were, in which its life develops itself, and in no other. The arts of expression by language differ from the arts of expression by form and color, and cannot be combined upon the same lines of representation. So, too, sculpture cannot perfect itself in the principles that apply to the pictorial art. A familiar example is the beautiful gate of the baptistery of San Giovanni, in Florence, which, by attempting to unite the plastic and graphic elements, or not keeping them distinct, fails of the highest effect. Yet the principles of all the arts are, in a measure, interchangeable, even as the laws of construction in architecture, bringing into play such analytic qualities as order, mass, and combination, may enter with effect into the composition of a picture, and lend it unity of design and a firmer tone.

One German writer classifies artistic forms into two — the mathematic and the organic ; in this way art appears, as it were, a second nature, which represents and reviews her processes. All rhythmic arts are governed by mathematical laws like architecture in its form in space, and music in its movement in time ; poetry also partakes of this regulated character. On the other hand, the arts which represent life, free life, such as landscape, animal existence, and, above all, the forms of human life in historic, *genre*, and portrait painting, and especially in sculpture, come under the class of organic laws ; which arts are essentially imitative, but at the same time they stand in connection with higher ideas. Yet here, too, it is difficult to draw distinctions. Painting expresses, above all, quality and character ; and yet in music there is as truly quality as quantity of sound, character as well as harmony. Colors have a genuine resemblance to tones and colors form an octave which produce concord or discord, and give rise to as various sensations. Architecture,

which is abstractly geometrical, becomes highly expressive of thought, feeling, and character, almost as much so as painting and sculpture.

Another classification separates all art into groups of technic, æsthetic, and phonetic, the first being those that minister to the primary wants, the second to the æsthetic, and the third those that express ideas by colors, forms, and words—in fact, language. But, actually, no positive limits can be assigned to these varieties as a question of fact, and it is rather a matter of degree than of classification. While, therefore, it is highly productive of thought to make this effort to classify, and is useful also as bringing out more clearly the underlying principles of art, it is evident, as is shown in the classification of “imitative,” “symmetric,” and “intellectual” in our author’s admirable book, that a truly deep-grounded and philosophical classification has not even by him been reached. In the above I have alluded to theoretical rather than technical principles of art.

J. M. HOPPIN.

## SHAKESPEARIAN ENGLISH AND THE PRAYER BOOK.

WE know that the mortal parts of William Shakespeare were laid, and still remain, within the consecrated walls of Trinity Church, and in the custody of Trinity parish, Stratford-upon-Avon. We know that within those same walls he was baptised. Libraries have been and are still being written about this man. Not England and America alone, where his language is spoken, but the entire civilisation of this planet are concerned in his apotheosis. But it is a most weighty and pregnant reflection, that of all his crowded life, and the eminent part he played in English and Elizabethan history, absolutely the only records concerning him which are authentic, authoritative, and beyond cavil, — which no traditions qualify and no chronicles dispute, — are two entries made by the proper officers of the Anglican Church, one at the outset and the other at the term and fine of his earthly career. These two records are : —

I. The Christening. "a 1564 — April 26. Gulielmus, Filius Johannes Shakespeare."

II. The Burial. "1616 April 25. Will Shakespeare. Gent."

The very earliest book of verse put into my childish hands was a volume entitled *Christian Ballads*, by Arthur Cleveland Coxe ; and, as I regard the simple entries above given, a fragment from that volume comes back to me again : —

For our mother the Church hath never a child  
To honor above the rest.

Was there ever a more extreme and capital comment to his text? How greater even than mighty Shakespeare is the common fold that guards us all ; that puts its seal upon us in our mother's arms, and marshals its centuries of sentinels over our dust ! But over against these two entries must be written another, not official, yet among the scant and "frail memorial"

of those Shakespearian days, impossible to be overlooked. In or about, certain not later than, 1708, the Rev. Richard Davies, Rector of Sapperton in Gloucestershire, writes (in his marginal memoranda upon some manuscript bequeathed to him by his predecessor, the Rev. William Fulman, and now in the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford) the words: "He (Shakespeare) died a Papist."

Between the making of this latter entry and the second record, quoted above, at least ninety-two years had elapsed. This lapse of time imposes upon the Davies entry not only the legal quality of hearsay, but easily relegates it to the standing of tradition. We might, therefore, fairly disregard it as against the official record which has become a muniment. But is there not a historical reconciliation possible, permitting both to stand? Let us advise ourselves as to this.

In and during the years 1564-1619, the Church of England was the only Church in England. A man to have been a church-member at all must have been a member of the English Church. To-day there are thousands of Englishmen who not only are not members of its fold, but neglect to conform to any religious body. But such was not the case then. All England, constructively at least, belonged to the Church, — the national Church, — whose policy was concurrent and consonant with the policy of the throne and of the temporal State. There were nine thousand four hundred of the parochial clergy, and, of this sum total, less than two hundred had avoided or denied their allegiance to the supremacy of the Queen. To these parochial clergy it was as much the custom for the people to repair for advice, for guidance, for baptisms, marriages, funerals, in sickness, bereavement, for superintendence of local festivals of calendar or political holidays or celebrations, as for the collectors of the Queen's taxes to visit the people to swell her majesty's revenue. Romanist families accepted the Church's sacraments; — could not do otherwise if they visibly accepted any public sacrament at all. The statute books of Elizabeth — and we are quoting the record (doubtless there were exceptions, but private exceptions impeach nothing) — recognised nothing but the one National Church. Almost a complete century was to elapse before English Roman Catholics were to so announce themselves; to deny the validity of Anglican baptisms; to protest against the English throne as visible and

ceremonial head of a Church within the geographical boundaries of England and commissioning bishops. These statutes of Elizabeth worked a complete transfer of the organisation, system, clergy, and laity of the Church under Mary to the Church under Elizabeth. When the question before us is, therefore, concerning the status of a man born in 1564, and dying in 1616; who was baptised in and buried from a Christian church in England, and in accordance with a ritual, we are narrowed to the record. Let us see what this record is. Fuller, in his *Church History* (in a passage far too long to give here), narrates very graphically the deliberation with which even points of ritual involving matters of doctrine were removed. And to show that to the people, the worshippers, there was always a Church, no matter what ruled the State, I am constrained to quote a remarkable passage from Froude's *Life of Bunyan* [p. 14], speaking even of the times when Puritanism became rampant and was supposed to have driven every priest of the Anglican communion into exile:—

There was still an Established Church in England, and the Constitution of it had not yet been altered. The Presbyterian platform threatened to take the place of Episcopacy, and soon did take it; but the Clergyman was still a Priest, and was still regarded with pious veneration in the country districts as a semi-supernatural being. The altar yet stood in its place, the Minister still appeared in his surplice, and the Prayers of the Liturgy continued to be read or intoned. The old familiar bells, Catholic as they were in all the emotions they suggested, called the congregation together with their musical peal, though in the midst of triumphant Puritanism.

And if this was the situation one hundred and twenty years later, after the Puritan had become master, we would easily conclude, even were not the record before us, and even were matters of private consideration—as they certainly are not here—presented, that this man, born in or about 1564, and attaining his majority in or about 1585, must have been more or less subjected to the influences of the Anglican ritual, must have been, for the purposes of grouping him as to matters of worship, if not of discipline, an Anglican Churchman. And that this is not only a logical, but a historical deduction as well, we quote once more from Froude [*History of England*, vol. vii. p. 472]:—

In 1562 De Quadra wrote to the Spanish Minister at Rome, begging

him to ask the Pope, in the name of English Catholics, whether they might be present without sin at the Common Prayers. The case was a new and not an easy one, for the Prayer Book contained neither impiety nor false doctrine. The prayers themselves were those of the (Roman) Catholic Church, altered only so far as to omit the merits and the intercession of the saints ; so that except for the concealment and the injury which might arise from the example, there would be nothing in the compliance itself positively unlawful. The Communion could be evaded ; on that point they did not ask for a dispensation. They simply desired to be informed whether they might attend the ordinary services.

It would appear, therefore, that in the formative years of Shakespeare's life, even had he not been enrolled among its children, he could not well have escaped the genial influences of the English Church. These days were a sort of era of good feeling in theological matters. Elizabeth was making everything tend to the furtherance of quiet and theological disarmament, — converting everybody into a friend and upholder, first of all, of her throne. Her first policy was to unite her subjects for her own support ; after that, the Deluge, if necessary, but this must come first. So, devout a head of the English Church as she assumed to be, she proposed, and, where proposition might fall short, commanded, tolerance if not neutrality. She did not, therefore, desire that her own clergy should preach, even before herself, uninstructedly. Dean Knowell, her own chaplain, delivering a sermon once at Windsor, touched, we may believe severely, on the use of images in public worship. "To your text, Mr. Dean, to your subject," shouted her majesty from the royal pew.

In this policy of Elizabeth may be found, I think, the reason why the Shakespeare plays indulge so rarely and so very covertly only in digs at the Puritans, whose idiosyncrasies were beginning certainly to attract attention. So long as Elizabeth herself, the court, did not discourage them, Shakespeare was far too prudent a man of business, too tender of his theatrical concessions and licenses, to poke fun where not perfectly sure of the reception his humor might find. He had made one grave mistake when he gave the name of "the Protestant Martyr," Sir John Oldcastle, to his chiefest comic character, and had not only been peremptorily commanded to change it to Sir John Falstaff, but incorporate in the text of his piece (where

it stands to-day) an abject apology for his error; nor can we imagine him anyways anxious to reinvoké the experience. In 1614, when King James was on the throne, Ben Jonson was not prevented by any political considerations from lampooning Puritans and Puritanism to his heart's content in his *Bartholomew Fair*. But, under Elizabeth, he probably would have received an official envelope from the Master of the Revels commanding him into the presence.

No matter, then, were the tendency of the parents Papistical or Calvinistic, the English child would have been brought up under the liturgical influence of the English Church, and have continued under those influences to his adult years. When Mr. Davies, therefore, used the word "Papist" (even were it not hearsay evidence ninety-one years old) he certifies to nothing that can militate against the records before us. The English of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer is repeated for us twice, — once in the King James Version of the Scriptures and once in the Shakespeare works. But beyond these it appears no more, and is now, henceforth and forever, a lost art. Since the only two volumes in our language, of which complete verbal concordances exist, are this version and these works, it is no perilous or ponderous task to draw up lists of parallelisms between them, — indeed, only the virtuoso, who makes collections of these lists, knows how easy. These lists are all well enough in their way. It is only when their compilers begin drawing conclusions from them, and basing more or less startling and always subjective propositions upon them that danger lurks behind.\* For my own part, I have no respect for these tables of parallelisms. They have proved to us over and over again that Bacon wrote "Shakespeare," and might prove Robert Burton to have been Thomas à Kempis did not the chronologies interfere. To the casual reader these paradoxes are always wonderful. But, on more careful examination of the

\* Anybody is at liberty in these times to incorporate items into Shakespearian "biography." From a periodical printed in New York city, called *Frank Leslie's Sunday Magazine* [November, 1879, p. 518], I copy, with what gravity I can assume, the following: "During the last years of his (Shakespeare's) life, it is stated that he and his family attended the parish church where the Rev. Richard Byfield, an eminent Puritan minister and father of the distinguished commentator on the *Epistle to the Colossians*, commenced his ministry, A. D. 1606. From the fact that Shakespeare was during the last years of his life the constant hearer of this eminent and energetic preacher of the gospel, we may reasonably hope for the best of consequences."

conditions upon which the paralleled works were themselves written, the wonder is, not that such tables can be made, but that they are not larger. I know no clearer way of demonstrating an author's individuality than by illustrating how small a portion of his vocabulary was that of his contemporaries as well. If parallelisms between contemporary writers employing the same vernacular did not exist, that would certainly be the most wonderful of all. But, should the supreme fact turn out to be that it was this English Liturgy from which Shakespeare drew his beauty and his strength, surely to lead up to its discovery were labor well undertaken. The time may come, and the demonstration with it. For the present, isolated particles toward accumulating proof — such as those I shall endeavor to submit in the present brief and imperfect paper — can perhaps only be expected.

It is to be remembered that the differentiation, so pungently described by Sir Walter Scott in the first chapter of *Ivanhoe*, in the dialogue between Gurth and Wamba, still obtained in the England of Shakespeare's youth. The swineherd still watched and raised for market his Saxon sheep, which became *mutton* when dressed for the Norman gentleman's table. It was only when ready for the gentle that the Saxon lamb became the Norman *veal*, or the prepared Saxon ox was Normanised into *beef*. In a most careful examination of the English of Shakespeare's predecessors and contemporaries and of the secular literature of his models and forerunners, I can find nothing like the following effort to reach, in one expression, both extremes of this general speech : —

Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us in sundry places to *acknowledge* and *confess* our manifold sins and wickedness : and that we should not *dissemble* or *cloak* them before the face of Almighty God our Heavenly Father. But confess them with an *humble, lowly, penitent*, and *obedient* heart : to the end that we may obtain forgiveness of the same through his infinite goodness and mercy ; . . . yet ought we chiefly so to do when we *assemble* and *meet* together.

And, in the General Confession immediately following, "We have *erred* and *strayed* from thy ways like lost sheep."

Any one with Mrs. Clarke's concordance at hand can find this tempering of Saxon with Norman and Norman with Saxon in Shakespeare. But the situation is, that we can find it nowhere else, until we come to 1611, the year in which Shakespeare laid

down his pen (as the records prove), and went to farming and speculating in the tithes at Stratford-upon-Avon; and 1611 was the exact date of the publication of the King James Version. Now the royal translators, in order to make their work of the greatest good to the greatest number, found themselves obliged to take — not to make — a vernacular: and what they did take was actually this lofty vernacular of the English Common Prayer Book. But Shakespeare had used this same vocabulary for twenty years, his compositions ceasing even as the 1611 translation was delivered to his countrymen. It is this situation, and not the mere fact that we can, with a Cruden's and a Clarke's concordance, pile up reams of parallelisms between the language of the King James Bible and of the Shakespeare plays, that hints of the possibility of material lurking behind either suggestion of where William Shakespeare — untaught of schools and unlearned of libraries — found his English.

Of course the present space will permit but small citation in the premises. It is to be hoped that some scholar may yet find leisure to frame a complete gnomon hereto. But a few specimen notes may be made.

I. "Let my tongue *adhere* to the roof of my mouth" [*Psalms* cxxxvii. 6]; "That they would *adhere* unto the Lord" [*Acts* xi. 23]; "*Adhere* to that which is good" [*Romans* xii. 9]. Now the King James translators, in every one of the above instances, use for the word I have italicised the word CLEAVE. But the modern meaning of the word CLEAVE is, not *to adhere*, but to do the exact reverse, *i. e.* to split off from; and the authority for it may be drawn from the writings of almost any of Shakespeare's contemporaries. But Shakespeare himself — even when his mind was occupied with the idea of a sword, which is used to cleave skulls or cut off human members — did not so employ the word. *E. g.*, "And this, thy son's blood, cleaving to my blade, shall rust upon my weapon" [*III. Henry VI.* i. iii. 50].

Thy thoughts I cleave to, what's thy pleasure? [*Tempest*, iv. i. 166.]

II. "Martha was occupied with much serving" [*Luke* x. 40]. The King James translators use the word *cumbered* for "occupied," making the text read "Martha was cumbered with much serving." This is, I think, a unique employment of the word, and I have only found it again in Shakespeare:—

Domestic fury and fierce civil strife

Shall cumber all the parts of Italy. [*Julius Caesar*, III. i. 264.]

III. In our present speech the word *let* implies a permission ; and the word *prevent*, its antipode, a prohibition. Shakespeare, however, used them in exactly the reverse meanings. To *let* a man to do a thing was to hold him back from (as we say to-day, to *prevent* his) doing that thing, whereas to prevent a man's doing a thing was to go before and assist him, to anticipate his wishes, to make the way clear for his performance. This was the Prayer Book usage. In the Collect for the seventeenth Sunday after Trinity we have, —

LORD, we pray thee that thy grace may always prevent and follow us, and make us continually to be given to all good works, through JESUS CHRIST our LORD, Amen.

And so always Shakespeare : —

But I do find it cowardly and vile  
For fear of what might fall, so to prevent  
The time of life. [*Julius Cæsar*, v. i. 103.]

The meaning of which is that the speaker thinks it cowardly and vile to anticipate the end (the full time or term of allotted years) of life ; to do, to-day, in his vigor and prime, what only could be excused in a man whose end was near. Brutus is telling Cassius that Cato did wrong to commit suicide ; that it is better and nobler to wait with patience for the summons that comes to us all than to assist or anticipate it by self-murder. He did not practise what he preached ; but the sentiment is none the less admirable, and is, moreover, and always has been, the Christian doctrine on the subject.

Content, my liege? Yes, but that I am prevented  
I should have begged I might have been employed.

[*I. Henry VI.* iv. i. 72.]

The King has asked Talbot to try and reason with his uncle of Burgundy, punishing him for his arrogance, if necessary. He commits the business of quieting Burgundy to Talbot, and asks him if he is not content with the job. To which, in the words above quoted, Talbot replies that that was just what he was going to do ; that, in fact, the king has anticipated him, assisted him, by royal warrant, in the very matter he was about to undertake.

I will answer you with gait and entrance. But we are prevented.

[*Twelfth Night*, III. i. 84.]

Viola was about to admit Sir Toby and Sir Andrew, but Maria opens the door first.

278 *Shakespearian English and the Prayer Book.*

I will tell you why, so shall my anticipation prevent your discovery.

[*Hamlet*, II. ii. 289.]

The King has sent Rozencrantz and Guildenstern to entrap Hamlet in his speech, and fasten madness, if possible, upon him. Hamlet interrupts Guildenstern, who is about to apologise for intruding: "My lord, we were sent for," by saying, in effect, I know all about what you are commissioned to do, and I will let my anticipation of what you are after make the discovery very easy for you, so you can earn your money very easily. Here is a hint, perhaps, as to how this word *prevent* came to so abruptly change its meaning. Here the prevention (*i. e.* anticipation) of Hamlet actually did prevent (obviate or obstruct) the discovery. A man going before a person can either make his path clear or block it. It is a mark, no doubt, of that tendency towards deterioration of language which Archbishop Trench has so eloquently demonstrated, which has made the more malign sense the sense which has ultimately survived.

Now, in every one of the above quotations from Shakespeare it will be noticed that the passage could be made intelligible by defining the word *prevent* as we use it commonly to-day. Stripped of their context, they undoubtedly would be so rendered. And, even with their context, it is only a careful reader to whom the more archaic form commends itself. But when the King James translators use the word, they employ it always in the sense in which Shakespeare found it in the Liturgy.

I prevented the dawning of the morning. [*Psalms* cxix. 147.]

We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the LORD, shall not prevent them which are asleep. [*I. Thessalonians* iv. 15.]

And as to the word *let*:—

I will work and who shall let it? [*Isaiah* xlii. 13.]

I proposed to come unto you but was let hitherto. [*Romans* i. 13.]

Only he who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way. [*II. Thessalonians* ii. 7.]

So always Shakespeare:—

Unhand me, gentlemen,

I'll make a ghost of him that lets me. [*Hamlet*, I. iv. 87.]

Therefore thy kinsmen are no let to me. [*Romeo and Juliet*, II. ii. 69.]

That I may know the let, why gentle peace

Should not expel these inconveniences. [*Henry V.* v. ii. 65.]

Most striking of all is the following: Shakespeare uses the

word *profit* in a sense in which I cannot discover his contemporaries employing it, nor yet his predecessors nor successors, viz., in the sense of *to become an expert*, to acquire a knowledge of, to make one's self proficient in. I find it used in this exact sense, however, in the King James Version.

When [*Galatians* i. 14] S. Paul says, "I profited by the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly jealous of the traditions of my fathers," it is not impossible that general readers might suppose the Apostle to mean that his zeal was to his own temporal emolument. But, by turning to Shakespeare, we find that *to profit* might mean *to become proficient in a thing*, to be an expert. For example, in *I. Henry IV.* III. i. 163, Hotspur complains of Glendower that he talks too much about necromancy and supernatural matters (alchemy and the like), and says that he had rather feed on cheese and garlies in a windmill than endure the Glendower conversation in a summer-house with the daintiest fare. But Mortimer reminds Hotspur that a gentleman is entitled to his hobby; and that even if Glendower does happen to believe himself versed in occult matters, such belief is harmless anyhow, especially since Glendower is a gentleman; that we must be prepared to put up with eccentricity when coupled with real worth, and so on. Mortimer, in saying this, begins —

In faith he is a worthy gentleman,  
Exceedingly well read, and profiting  
In strange concealments.

Glendower is not a magician himself, only interested in cabalistics. He has *profited*, that is, *become proficient in* them, and rather likes to harmlessly prate about them. And, on becoming familiar with the Apostle's career, we find this the exact sense in which he uses the Greek equivalent, and which the King James scholars so translated.

If I have dwelt upon the above examples to an unnecessary length, — giving several where one would have sufficed, — it is to emphasise what seems to me a most suggestive fact. What makes Shakespeare's plays so immensely valuable to scholars of our day, not only, but so permanently vital, whereas his contemporaries are tedious reading, and only open their sense to us with glossary and comment, is that Shakespeare wrote in the root English, pure and simple as he found it, whereas his contemporaries competed with each other which could most largely

deal in the fashions; that is to say, in the acquired and contemporary meanings of the particular time. There were fashions and tricks of time then as now, and Jonson, Greene, and the rest caught them and used them always. Mere literature is, after all, what Hamlet called Osric's flourishes and twitter, — a "tune of the time." We have had a dozen different tunes since Shakespeare. They have all passed away, but we read Shakespeare still. We cannot express the reason of Shakespeare's immortality better, after all, than by quoting the first piece of Shakespearian inductive criticism extant. That criticism is Aubrey's, and was written two hundred and sixty years ago. "His comedies will remain witt as long as the English tongue is understood, for that he handles *mores hominum*. Now our present writers reflect so much upon particular persons and coxcombities that, twenty years hence, they will not be understood."

To understand what old Aubrey meant by "coxcombities" we have but to open Jonson, and watch him ringing the changes on the word *humour*, for example (an overworked phrase, forced to do duty for phlegm, tendency, task, inclination, desire, passion, — almost anything. Shakespeare made one of his comic personages, Nym, caricature this over and over again, by lugging in the phrase senselessly every three words he spoke); whereas Shakespeare so resisted the temptation that a late writer has been able to demonstrate that he actually used once, and then forever discarded, a larger number of words than form the vocabulary of so great a poet as Dante, and nearly half the size of Milton's. ("The old grammarians said their word *supine* was so named because very seldom employed, and therefore was almost always lying on its back. The supines of Shakespeare outnumbered the employees of most authors.") \* And that so far from rejecting a Saxon for a Norman word (as some public school teachers, for reasons best known to themselves, assert to their pupils), he drew on Saxon and Norman alike, in about equal proportions. We have al-

\* J. O. Butler, *Once Used Words of Shakespeare*. New York: 1886. Press of the New York Shakespeare Society. In the most ignorant work on English I have ever seen (Mathew's *Words, their Use and Abuse*), occurs the following: "In his (Shakespeare's) loftiest flights, it is on the broad pinions of the Roman eagle that he soars; and we shall find, if we regard him closely, that every feather is plucked from its wing." [P. 181.] These "feathers" our author calls "Romanic," a word coined by himself, and correspondingly valuable.

ready found this duplicated use of the two languages, and only found it in the Liturgy of the Established Church.

The catena which confronts us, therefore, is (1) We find that the King James translators, in searching for a true vernacular that should be as permanent and as widely intelligible as possible, went to the English of the Prayer Book. (2) We find that what they brought from thence was just what William Shakespeare had already brought from somewhere and converted to his own despotic use. (3) We find that the product which the two—translators and Shakespeare—have presented us with as their own is practically unused and unclaimed by their contemporaries. Given this statement of facts,—if they be facts,—what are we to devise therefrom as to the probability of a source? What else than that their source was a common source,—that it was the Liturgy of the English Church which dominated the one as it dominated the other, and so supplies the long searched for and subjective originals of the English of Shakespeare? I indicate the problem and my own suggestions as to its solution for the crucible of more exact scholarship than mine.

Scores of such words as I have above cited there were which disappeared very shortly after the era of the King James Version. Many others, now quaint, conceited, or pedantic, survived much longer in the general use. Such as, for example, the verb *to tell*, in the sense of to count, to enumerate. As Milton, in *L'Allegro*,—

And every shepherd tells his tale  
Under the hawthorne in the vale,

meaning, not that the shepherd was “spinning yarns” to his fellows, but enumerating his sheep, to see if they were all on hand. “I may tell all my bones” [*Psalms* xxii. 17]; “I am famished in his service; you may tell every finger I have with my ribs” [*Merchant of Venice*, II. ii. 93]. But it is not these which “echo still of the stately times of great Elizabeth” as do those which seem only occurrent in our Common Prayer Book, in the English Scriptures of 1611, and in the great Shakespeare plays.

We have concordances to the King James Version, and to the Shakespeare works, and they might almost be used interchangeably. Whenever it becomes the grateful duty of some scholar to present us with a concordance of the first vernacular

English Common Prayer Book I believe that a reservoir of root words of hitherto unsuspected depth and quality will be added to our Shakespeare lexicographies. If allowed to speculate as to why succeeding generations of English literature should have missed the picturesqueness of this liturgical and Shakespearian diction, I should suggest that just as a wind-mill is more picturesque than a steam factory, or a lowing herd winding slowly over the lea than a train of box cattle-cars drawn by a greasy freight engine, just so we have paid for the convenience of a grammar by loss of the luxurious freedom of no grammar at all! So long as it was permitted to use any one part of speech for any other, — an adverb, adjective, preposition, or noun for a verb; an adverb, verb, adjective, or preposition for a noun, — it was impossible that, in the hands of men entirely great, beauty, color, and strength should not result. But that this resultant should show itself in the Liturgy, in the King James Vulgate, and in the Shakespearian opera, and be entirely missed in the diction of Shakespeare's profane contemporaries, is, I think, a phenomenon quite too marked to be reckoned as mere coincidence.

APPLETON MORGAN.

## THE CHURCH AND THE KIRK OF SCOTLAND.

1. *The Church Review*, April, 1887. Article by Rev. ARTHUR LOWNDES, M. A.
2. *Canon 55 of the Church of England*, 1604.

THE Canon of 1604 contains these words: "Ye shall pray for CHRIST's Holy Catholic Church, that is for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world, and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland." Our critic has attacked the position, that the Church of Scotland here spoken of was an Established Presbyterian Church, with that valor which has carried the British flag in triumph around the world. Whether his success is commensurate with his courage our readers must decide.

Before reaching the point at issue, one or two of his assertions must be briefly noticed. Where, for instance, he says, "It is of no use to proceed with the discussion (about the name of the Church) until the truth of that statement (about the meaning of the Canon), is acknowledged, it is to be presumed that he means acknowledged not by himself, but by the public."

The writer says that in the article which he criticises "a labored endeavor is made to show that the Church of England has spoken with an uncertain voice as to the necessity of Episcopal ordination." Reference to the authorities quoted will readily show that her most loyal defenders, so far from speaking with any uncertain voice, have explicitly declared that they recognised as churches bodies which did not have Episcopacy. Those, therefore, who wish to establish the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination as a fundamental principle of the Church, would do well to refute the assertions of Hooker, and Bancroft, and Bishop Hall, and Bishop White, and Dr. Beach, and a host of others in England and America before they attack the present writer.

Though our critic suggests "keeping strictly to the point," yet before reaching it he makes several extraordinary assertions

which have no bearing on the issue. We are not concerned, for instance, with his apprehension of the fearful consequences which must ensue if the Church of England chance to recognise as a Church a Presbyterian organisation; we need not criticise the logic of the statement that, "if the Church of England has recognised as the Church in Scotland the Presbyterian Kirk, then she cannot recognise the Episcopal Church in Scotland," nor the accuracy of the assertion that "the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States is the daughter of the Episcopal Church of Scotland"!!!

Our English reviewer thinks it *primâ facie* that the recognition of the Presbyterian Kirk as a Church by Convocation or by the King is most unlikely. Not so unlikely, perhaps, if we weigh the following considerations: this Canon of 1604 was "treated, concluded, and agreed upon by the Rev. Father in God Richard (Bancroft) . . . president of the Convocation . . . of Canterbury and the rest of the bishops and clergy in the same province, by his majesty's license." [Lathbury, *History Convocation*, London, 1853, p. 230.] Our critic thinks it unlikely that these bishops should have recognised the Presbyterian Kirk as a Church. He thereby differs from his own witness, Spottiswoode, who in 1610 was summoned with two other titular \* bishops from Scotland to receive in England and carry home a true Episcopacy. When the difficulties of their consecration were being discussed, —

A question in the mean time was moved by Dr. Andrewes, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish Bishops, who, as he said, 'must first be ordained Presbyter,' as having received no ordination from a Bishop. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained, 'That thereof there was no necessity, seeing where Bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the Presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the reformed Churches.' This applauded by the other Bishops, Ely acquiesced, and at the day and in the place appointed the three Scottish Bishops were consecrated.†

\* Titular bishops were men who, without either Episcopal consecration or Episcopal jurisdiction, had the title of bishops that they might vote in Parliament.

† *History of the Church of Scotland*, by Spottiswoode, or Spotswood, Lord Archbishop of S. Andrews and Privy Counsellor to Charles I. [London, 1655], p. 514.

Whatever other words Heylin may put into Bancroft's mouth on this occasion, Spottiswoode certifies that he used those given above.

As further proof of Bancroft's sentiments in 1606, only two years after the passage of the Canon under discussion, he said to the Presbyterian James Melville: "I am sure we both hold and keep the true grounds of religion and are brethren in Christ, and so should behave ourselves one towards another. Our difference is only in the governing of the Church, and some ceremonies; but I understand . . . your Kirk is almost brought to be one with ours in that also, for I am certain that there are constant moderators appointed in your General Assemblies, Synods, and Presbyteries." [Lawson, p. 281.] Can any man doubt what Bancroft understood by "the Church of Scotland" two years before this?

Now, as regards the King.

In 1592 Presbytery was established by Act of Parliament, and all other acts in opposition to the same were repealed. At this time, therefore, Episcopacy was abolished by law, and Presbytery legally established. It was at this time that James pronounced his celebrated speech in favor of the Presbyterian Church. Taking off his hat he rose and 'praised God that he was born to be a king of the purest Kirk in the world. As for our neighbor Kirk of England, they want nothing of the mass but the liftings.' [Lathbury, *History of English Episcopacy*, London, 1836, p. 96.]\*

Now, we are not concerned to vindicate King James's consistency, and most fortunately we have not to defend him from "hypocrisy," nor from vanity in having his head turned by the adulation of the English bishops, who said he spoke by inspiration. Still, it is to be hoped that these extracts will, beside conveying to our reviewer's mind several other wise and useful lessons, relieve him from all doubt as to whether King and Convocation could recognise the Presbyterian Kirk.

We need not concern ourselves with Chancellor Harington's exultation over the fact that some Presbyterian writers ignored the Kirk of 1604. Of course all who assert the Divine authority of Presbytery over King and Parliament wish to repudiate a Kirk which had even a titular Episcopate, and over which King and Parliament had some measure of authority. The chancellor and his new found allies may be left to fight out this battle with the Presbyterian writer, Dr. Cook, and many others of the same persuasion.

\* For further light about King James the critic is referred to his letter to Elizabeth in behalf of the Presbyterians. Fuller, *Church History of Britain* [London, 1837], vol. iii. pp. 112, 113.

It is not our province to reconcile the inconsistency, real or imaginary, between Canon 55 and the other Canons of 1604, nor to relieve them from their "muddle." This may be left to the clergy who should obey, and the courts who should interpret them.

We have but little to do with the dreadful consequence, that "the Canon not only in that case recognised the Kirk as a Church, and bracketed her with the Churches of England and Ireland, but recognised her as a branch of the Catholic Church." Our only concern with this fearful possibility is that the writer who sees this terrible apparition before him may not be open to conviction.

Indeed, we have naught to do with any *a priori* considerations, or spectres of the writer's own conjuring up. Nor need he have quoted Lords Lyndhurst and Brougham to prove that our Church recognises the orders of the Church of Rome. Who disputes it? and what has it to do with the matter in hand?

The only question at issue is, What was the Church of Scotland in 1604, when the Canon was passed?

The English clergyman quotes with great satisfaction a statement of Stephen that the Presbyterian form of government was abolished in 1600. Of this statement Stephen's only proofs are, not an Act of Parliament disestablishing the Presbyterian Church, *for there was none*, but the following facts: 1. That the General Assembly at Montrose, March 28, 1600, in the presence of the King, ratified the sittings of the titular bishops in Parliament. 2. The nominating of suitable persons to fill the vacant titular bishoprics, and thus restoring to Scotland what he well calls "a maimed and titular," a "shadow of Episcopacy." 3. The message of a dying Presbyterian "that there was a necessity of restoring the ancient governors of the Church." \* "Thus," that is in consequence of these three things, "after an establishment of only eight years the Presbyterian system was demolished." We submit that his premises do not justify his conclusion; *Presbytery was established by Act of Parliament, and only an Act of Parliament could have disestablished it.*

As our critic admires Stephen, we may, without discussing

\* Stephen, *History of the Church of Scotland*, London, 1843, vol. i. pp. 411, 412, 413.

the assertion "that the will of the king made for Episcopacy no school-boy will deny," remind him "that King James has the merit of forming the Presbyterian discipline in the mould in which we see it established in Scotland at the present day." [Stephen, page 398.]

Doubtless so strenuous an advocate of the "no bishop no church theory" will also be edified by the conclusion which Stephen draws from the death of Beaton, the Romish Archbishop of Glasgow, who withdrew finally from Scotland in 1559, and died in Paris in 1603. "This [that is Beaton] was the last link of the apostolic chain which had come down without interruption from S. Paul. . . . This chain remained broken for only seven years, when an apostolic character was again imparted to the Scottish Church by the consecration of Spottiswoode in 1610." [Stephen, pp. 428, 429.]

Thus, according to the reviewer's own witness, there was no Episcopal Church in Scotland in 1604, when the Canon commanding persons to pray for the Church in Scotland was passed.

With this confession we will allow Stephen to leave the witness stand for the present, reserving the right to summon him hereafter.

We come, then, to the question which our censor has so clearly stated, "What was the Church of Scotland when the Canon was passed, Episcopal or Presbyterian?" Beyond all question, it was Presbyterian.

As the reviewer says, "There is but one way out of the difficulty," and that is an appeal to "the historical facts." From 1577 to 1610 there were no episcopally consecrated bishops in Scotland. All the Romish bishops had either finally left Scotland or had died, *leaving no consecrated successors*. The Episcopal Church in Scotland, as reestablished by James in 1610, "was never linked with the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which was prostrated by the Reformation."\* Let his own witness describe the state of affairs in Scotland after the Reformation was introduced in 1560:—

Knox taught his followers to despise the apostolic succession of the Episcopal order and the laying on of hands. If any man was thought *qualified*, and he was elected by the people and recognised and inducted by the superintendent, it was sufficient to constitute

\* Lawson, pp. 40, 64, 65.

what they called a minister of the Gospel. The superior or *quasi* episcopal order of the superintendents had no other ordination than the answering of certain questions, a few prayers, and the acclamation of the people then present. Knox himself inaugurated the whole of the superintendents, and in the face of the apostolic practice and that of the whole Church, besides S. Paul's careful instructions to Timothy, he judged the ancient and universal rite of laying on of hands to be not necessary. This daring omission continued till about the year 1592, when King James insisted upon its resumption, and then they were mere laymen who did lay on hands; all the Romish priests who had renounced popery had long before that time been removed to another world.\* Christ gave a commission to His apostles with whom He promised to be to the end of the world, which implies an apostolic succession, but Knox *cut off* that succession, and *without any new divine commission*, he established a new succession which had no other authority but his own 'devout imagination.' From a natural mistake arising out of the circumstance that four of the Roman bishops embraced the Reformation, Mr. Palmer has taken the most charitable view of the Knoxian Church, and says, that after the Concordat of Leith, 'thenceforward the dioceses of Scotland were filled by bishops who were *consecrated* by other prelates and sat in Parliament.' Now this is a judgment in charity, but not in truth; for, in point of fact, only one of them, Galloway, *might* really have been consecrated, the other three were mere laymen, and the bishop of Galloway never officiated at the inauguration of the other titular bishops, nay, he himself was of new inaugurated by Knox, that is, ordained to be superintendent of his own Diocese of Galloway. And Mr. Palmer adds, still in the spirit of charity, 'such being in general the position of the Church of Scotland up to the accession of James VI to the throne of England, there seemed *no reason to dispute* its character as a Church of CHRIST.' But, with respectful deference for Mr. Palmer's judgment in this case, we must beg leave to dispute the title of the Knoxian Kirk to the character of a Church of CHRIST, because most of those who were made bishops and three of the papal prelates that conformed had no orders at all. Their receiving a public and legislative sanction, sitting in Parliament, and being *called* Bishops, could never constitute them successors of the Apostles.†

As for the other bishops (besides Galloway) and abbots who joined the new establishment of Knox, they were mere laymen, never having been in the Holy Orders, although they enjoyed the titles and revenues of the sees and abbeys, and sat in Parliament as spiritual peers. It is perhaps happy for the well being of the Scottish Church that the papal line of succession was entirely extinguished. . . . It pleased God

\* Stephen, vol. i. p. 202.

† Ibid., vol. i. pp. 244, 245.

to suppress it entirely for the sacrilegious intrusion of laymen into holy functions, etc.\*

The acts of almost every Assembly recognised the episcopacy of the superintendents, and the Leith agreement approved of their continuance under the ancient titles of Bishops and Archbishops. [Stephen, p. 253.]

Knox, at his death in 1572, "left all the bishoprics in the kingdom filled, though, unfortunately, they had no canonical office, but were mere laymen. This arose from his having dispersed and set aside the ancient and scriptural rite of the laying on of hands out of hatred to popery, and of his stern rejection of such of the bishops of the Papal Church as really had been consecrated to the Episcopal office, and therefore could have continued it in the Reformed Church." [Stephen, pp. 253, 254.]

So much for the "Episcopacy" which Knox established.

Having thus given our critic the benefit of his own witness, we will summon one whose authority he will not dispute to give a brief outline of ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland. "John Knox arrived in Edinburgh, May 2, 1559." †

In 1560 Parliament met in Edinburgh. This Parliament "sealed the fate of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Scotland as an ecclesiastical establishment." [Lawson, p. 41.] The "Confession of Faith professed and believed by the Protestants within the realm of Scotland" was confirmed by the Three Estates, and the jurisdiction of the Pope in Scotland was abolished. [Lawson, p. 44.]

All the acts of this Parliament were confirmed by Queen Mary in 1577. [Lawson, p. 45.]

In 1560 Knox appointed superintendents over the preachers in the several towns. Some of these superintendents had been ordained by Cranmer, some by Romish bishops, and some with only Presbyterian ordination. [Lawson, pp. 49, 50.]

Such was the singular amalgamation of individuals who at first supplanted the ancient Hierarchy. . . . They received considerable accessions before 1571-72, when Episcopacy was reintroduced . . . if that can be called Episcopacy which consisted merely of the restoration of the titles of the Dioceses, the holders never having been consecrated, etc. [Lawson, p. 77.]

\* Stephen, p. 205.

† Lawson, *Episcopal Church in Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1844, p. 39.

By 1571 the ancient Hierarchy was extinct, or at best only represented by the temporising Bishops of Galloway and Orkney. . . . No form of Church government, not even the superintendent system, was legally acknowledged. . . . The laws of the kingdom still recognised the clerical order as one of the estates of Parliament. . . . In progress of time . . . there was a near prospect of the total extinction of the spiritual branch of the legislature. The persons who administered the government of James . . . dreaded that if, under the reign of a minor, one of the estates ceased to exist, their proceedings might be afterwards declared illegal. . . . The lords thought it expedient that the Ecclesiastical State should sit in Parliament, and therefore were eager to restore Bishops, *that their acts might be valid*. It was consequently determined to establish Episcopacy, if that can be so termed which was merely nominal, and had no pretensions to the Episcopal function. Certain of the Protestant preachers were allowed to vote in the Parliament as the successors of the defunct prelates and officially appointed Bishops of the vacant Sees. . . . The persons selected for this visionary episcopate were John Douglas, etc. . . . Another motive for restoring the nominal order of Bishops was with their consent to secure a certain portion of the patrimony to each See, while the rest was to be conveyed by statute to those of the nobility already in possession of the ecclesiastical plunder. . . . Douglas was elected *titular* Archbishop, titular for want of real ecclesiastical consecration.\*

The letter of consecration was directed to the Rev. Father in God, Robert Stewart, titular Bishop of Caithness, and two unconsecrated superintendents. Surely Stewart has sufficient title, since there is "*no ground to think* that this person was ever duly, and according to the constant invariable usage of the primitive Catholic Church, *vested with any sacred character at all*." [Quoted from Bishop Keith by Stephen, vol. i. p. 232.]

After this "consecration" Douglas was forced by Morton to vote in Parliament as Archbishop of S. Andrews. [Lawson, p. 98.]

Several of the Bishoprics were speedily filled by . . . men among the Reformed preachers, and this novel 'Episcopacy' or form of Ecclesiastical polity, even worse than the superintendent system, and more objectionable, because it was the shadow without the substance, was soon completely carried into operation.

It was no Episcopacy at all, or so only in name . . . the whole was a political arrangement to . . . introduce a set of men into the parlia-

\* Lawson, pp. 96, 97, 98; Stephen, vol. i. p. 232.

ments to represent the defunct and absent Bishops . . . assuming their ecclesiastical titles and pretending to be invested with functions which it was impossible to obtain without consecration from Bishops regularly and Canonically consecrated. Episcopacy without the succession is nothing and differs nothing from Presbyterianism. They (these so-called Bishops) were long known by the very appropriate, significant sobriquet of *Tulchan* Bishops, derived from a practice then prevalent of stuffing a calf's skin with straw and placing it before a cow to induce the animal to give milk, which figure was called a tulchan.

The Tulchan hierarchy was a complete deception, and was merely one of *titles* connected with personal arrangements and political expediency . . . gross perversion of the real Episcopate . . . schismatical profanity. . . .

The men who figured in it ought never to have been recognised by Keith in his enumeration of the Scottish Bishops. [Lawson, pp. 111, 112.]

It was not always required that these Tulchan Bishops should have had even lay ordination. [Lawson, p. 125.]

So far from possessing Episcopal jurisdiction, these Tulchan Bishops were subject to the General Assembly. [Lawson, p. 126 *et passim*.]

The Church was extinct . . . and the whole clerical function usurped by self-constituted preachers. As to the titular Episcopate, it was so utterly helpless, inefficient, and contemptible, that it is astonishing how the men invested with it had the boldness to call themselves and the presumption to consider themselves bishops in any sense, yet that they did so is evident from their signatures and their seals in which their names are recorded as if they had been duly consecrated and a part of the great succession of the Christian ministry. [Lawson, p. 130.] The truth is, that in Scotland the Church Catholic became extinct from the Reformation to 1610. [Lawson, p. 133.]

As to the titular Episcopacy, —

This mongrel species of Prelacy cannot meet the approbation of any true Episcopalian. Though certain eager advocates of . . . the uninterrupted succession have persisted that Episcopacy always existed in Scotland . . . how could they acknowledge as bishops men who professed (possessed?) as little of the Episcopal power as they did of the Episcopal revenues, who were subject to the authority of an assembly composed of pretended presbyters and mere laics, by whom they were liable to be tried, censured, suspended, and deposed, and who, in one word, were utterly destitute of Canonical consecration? [Quoted with approval from Dr. McCrae by Lawson, p. 133.]

We now come to that event which imparted to the Church of Scot-

land its Episcopal constitution which it had previously been merely in name. This was the consecration of Archbishop Spottiswoode of Glasgow, Bishop Lamb of Brechin, and Bishop Hamilton of Galloway. [Lawson, p. 315.]

They went to London at the royal summons in 1610.

At the first audience the King declared what the business was for which he had called them . . . that since he could not make them bishops, nor could they assume that honor to themselves . . . he had called them to England, that being consecrated themselves, they might at their return give Ordination to those at home. [Spottiswoode, p. 514.]

Hence, when our critic speaks of the Assemblies of Perth and Dundee as restoring "Episcopacy" in 1598, and the "Archbishop" of Glasgow as being restored to his See in 1599, when Chancellor Harington or his Presbyterian allies speak of "Episcopacy" as having existed in Scotland *at any time between 1577 and 1610*, we must not be misled by a name, we must remember that "all that glitters is not gold," that by "Episcopacy" they refer to those titular or Tulchan bishops, that is mere laymen, "consecrated" by laymen. We are reminded of Charles Wesley's account of Dr. Coke's consecration:—

So easily are Bishops made,  
By man's or woman's whim;  
Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid,  
But — who laid hands on him?

It matters not what Chancellor Harington and some Presbyterians may think: it is inconceivable that any man who held any theory of succession would, unless determined to prove a point at all hazards, recognise as an Episcopal Church one in which there was not one Episcopally ordained minister, in which the so-called Bishops were mere laymen, set apart by laymen, sometimes with, sometimes without laying on of hands, subject to Synods and General Assemblies to whom they were responsible and by whom they might be removed.

Those blinded by zeal to support a theory, and those who agree in Church polity with Chancellor Harington, John Knox, our English critic, and the Presbyterians, may be forgiven for mistaking this "mongrel species" for a Divinely given Episcopate, but a Prayer Book Churchman, who holds that "from the Apostles' times there have been three orders of ministers in

CHRIST'S Church," must be excused from accepting this spurious coin as genuine currency.

Thus it is established beyond all doubt that when the Canon of 1604 commanded prayers for the Church of Scotland, it could not have meant what any Churchman would call an Episcopal Church, unless it intended to command prayers for the dead or the unborn.

The question, What was the Church of Scotland when this Canon passed? can be answered in few words: The Parliament, which met at Edinburgh, April 3, 1592, "is of importance in the annals of Presbyterianism, as the first which ratified their system as an Establishment." [Lawson, p. 239.]

The King thought it necessary to strengthen his interest by obliging the Kirk, and thus the statute passed by which it is enacted that it shall be lawful to the Kirk and the ministers . . . to hold General Assemblies, with this Proviso however, That the King or his commissioners shall be present at each General Assembly and appoint the time and place for the next meeting.\* . . . Further, the Synodical and Provincial Assemblies held twice a year are ratified and confirmed; and so are the Presbyteries and Particular Sessions, together with the whole Jurisdiction and Discipline of the Kirk, etc. This Assembly has authority to depose the office-bearers. . . . The Presbyters have authority within their bounds, etc. It belongs to this Eldership to take care the word of God is preached . . . that the Sacraments are rightly administered, the Discipline maintained. . . .

The Statute granting commission to Bishops, etc., to receive His Highness' Presentation to Benefices . . . is declared to be expired . . . for the future all Presentations to Benefices shall be directed to the respective Presbyteries. Thus Episcopacy† was at last abolished, and Presbytery made the established religion. [Collier, *Church History*, London, 1714, vol. ii. pp. 635, 636.]

From 1597 to 1603, our critic thinks King James "our best authority," who "for the space of six years labored to depress the Presbyterians." The logic of this teaches that the Puritans under Elizabeth overthrew Episcopacy because they labored to depress it.

Perhaps, however, the laws of the realm "are our best authority."

The King and Council, though they were pleased to confer on

\* No wonder divine-right Presbyterians disclaim this Kirk.

† "Tulchan," or "Phantom" Episcopacy.

Presbytery the advantages of an establishment, had not the least intention of relinquishing . . . the Titular Episcopate as one of the three Estates. In 1597 an act was passed declaring that 'all ministers provided to prelacies should have votes in Parliament.' . . . His Majesty, with advice and consent of the Estates, decerns and declares that the Kirk within this realm, wherein the same religion is professed, is the true and holy Kirk,\* . . . that such pastors . . . within the same as at any time His Majesty shall . . . provide to the office . . . of a Bishop, Abbot, or other Prelate shall . . . have vote in Parliament . . . that all . . . Bishoprics presently vacant in His Highness' hands . . . shall be disposed to actual Preachers and Ministers in the Kirk. [Lawson, p. 241.]

In 1597 it was further provided concerning the persons to be presented to the bishoprics, that the King would consult with "the General Assembly of the ministers at such times as his majesty shall think expedient . . . without prejudice † always in the mean time of the jurisdiction and discipline of the Kirk established by Acts of Parliament made in any time preceding, and permitted by the said acts to all General and Provincial Assemblies and whatsoever Presbyteries and Sessions of the Kirk." [Lawson, p. 242.]

In 1604, the very year the Canon was enacted, *the Scottish Parliament passed another Act ratifying* and approving "all and whatsoever Acts of Parliament in favor of the (Presbyterian) Kirk and Religion professed and established within the realm of Scotland." ‡

This Presbyterian Kirk was, like the (Episcopal) Church of England, established not by the will of the King, nor by resolution of any Ecclesiastical Assembly, but by Act of Parliament, and, like the Church of England, it could only be disestablished by Act of Parliament.

This Presbyterian Kirk remained the Established Church of Scotland until "the indiscreet zeal of some particular Church judicatories . . . provoked the overthrow of the Presbyterian Church first in the year 1606 and next in 1661." [Lawson, p. 264, quoted from Scott of Perth.]

Two years after the passage of the Canon of the Church of

\* Our critic will please notice how his "authority" King James speaks about the Kirk.

† Our critic will again observe his "authority" King James "depressing the Kirk."

‡ *Acta Scot. Parl.*, vol. iv. p. 264.

England, speaking of the Church of Scotland, in the Parliament at Perth, July 6, 1606, —

An act was passed declaring the King's prerogative and supremacy 'over all estates, persons and causes whatsoever, within his said kingdom.' This was followed by an act in which the Episcopal Church\* was solemnly declared to be the national establishment.

The two acts contained the establishment of the (Tulchan) Episcopal Church, . . . and the total overthrow of the Presbyterian Church Government. [Lawson, p. 277.]

Even then there was only this Tulchan Episcopate until 1610.

In 1607 "it was merely a nominal Episcopal Church, for its Bishops were not then consecrated, and the Ministers were unordained." †

What must be a man's ideas of Apostolic succession who grows pale at the possibility of recognising the Presbyterians as in the holy Catholic Church, and yet can accept for reality this "phantom episcopate"!

Our reviewer will be glad to hear once more from his witness Stephen. Speaking of the consecration of Spottiswoode and his colleagues in 1610, he says:—

These three consecrated Bishops conveyed the Episcopal powers which they had now received in a Canonical way to their former titular brethren. . . . Thus (in 1610), after fifty years of confusion, we see an Episcopal Church once more settled in Scotland, and a regular Apostolic succession of Episcopacy introduced . . . which had long before failed, without any attempt to keep it up. [Quoted by Stephen, p. 45, from Bishop Skinner.]

Since, therefore, by "the historical facts" to which our critic in an evil hour appealed, there was, by his own witness and many others, *no true Episcopal Church in Scotland until six years after the Canon was passed, since the Presbyterian Kirk was established by Act of Parliament in 1592, and was not disestablished until 1606, two years after the enactment of the Canon*, we shall, with all deference to the English clergyman, and leaving the public to decide between us, venture to repeat the assertion, that "The Church of Scotland, recognised as a Church by Canon of the Church of England, is an Established Presbyterian Church."

KINLOCH NELSON.

\* Tulchan Episcopate.

† Lawson, p. 254.

## THE VOICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON EPISCOPAL ORDINATION AND THE SCOTTISH KIRK.

1. *The Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons according to the Order of the Church of England.*
2. *The Church Review* for February, 1887. Article by Professor KINLOCH NELSON, D. D., on *Shall the Protestant Episcopal Church Change its Name?*

"ENGLAND expects every man to do his duty" is a watchword that has fired many a heart since that October day when an illustrious son of an English priest flashed it forth as his signal to his assembled fleet. It was an injunction on all, from the cabin boy to the admiral, to watch, stand fast, be strong, and quit themselves like men.

It is in response to such a call that this article is written. When the last article was written there was no intention to go farther than with the consideration of the assertion that the Church of England had by a formal Canon recognised as a Church the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland.

To enter upon the broader question as to whether the Church of England has spoken with an uncertain voice on the necessity of Episcopal ordination has been in a manner thrust on the writer as a consequence of the last article. To draw back because a stouter champion is not ready to defend the breach would not be what a Nelson would have expected. When away from the shadow of her ancient foundations, and with much of the lore of her sons, who are now at rest, having fought the good fight for the mother they loved so well, unaccessible and in a country where libraries are scant, a son, be he ever so loyal, may well hesitate still further before he enter into the fray.

Though a mother needs the worthiest of her sons to defend her when attacked, yet a pebble in the hands of a stripling may slay a giant. If all, then, is not said that could be said, and if

what is said is not said to the best advantage, in the following pages, the fault lies with the writer and not with thee, for —

I joy, dear mother, when I view  
Thy perfect lineaments, and hue  
Both sweet and bright.  
Beauty in thee takes up her place,  
And dates her letter from thy face  
When she doth write.

In support of his pleas, for they cannot be called arguments, that "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America" should retain her present long and cumbrous designation, Professor Nelson, after a preliminary discussion on the original adoption of the words "Protestant Episcopal," on the possibility of a secession of some Dioceses if the name is altered, on the difficulty of choosing a true and suitable name if there is an alteration, proceeds to urge three main objections to any alteration in the name of "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

At the outset will Dr. Nelson pardon us if we make the following definition, to hold only so far as this present discussion goes, and not to compromise either party.

The "American Church" shall mean "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

We intend no indignity, and desire to cast no slur on "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America" by calling her by three words instead of ten; but a citizen of a nation that is so terribly anxious for brevity as to consider it a gain to leave one little letter out of a word, when slower Englishmen are still content to write "honour" and not "honor," "traveller" and not "traveler," will surely not complain if the limit of an Englishman's patience is reached when he has to write out every few lines, "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," with a prayer book of "the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America" always open before him lest he should make a mistake in the title.\* We did not like to take the liberty of abbreviating the

\* The writer in conversation with a worthy layman of "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," remarked on the wonderful influence the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States seemed to have in proportion to its numbers.

"You mean, sir, I suppose, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States;" replied the layman, with much dignity.

Since then the writer has always endeavored not to offend again, but to mind the *ins* and *ofs* of the names of the Sister Church.

title lest Professor Kinloch Nelson, D. D., who seems very uncertain as to what constitutes a Church, should have asked, if we spoke of "the American Church," what Church we meant.

Assuming, however, the acceptance of the definition, and thankful for it, we shut up the prayer book of the American Church and proceed to open the *Church Review* for February, at the article of Professor Nelson.

The history of the adoption of the words "Protestant Episcopal" by the American Church does not fall within the scope of this article, though it does seem unfortunate that a Church anxious to maintain a close bond of union with the Church of England should have adopted as one of its designations the only one which that Church had declined just a hundred years before.\*

As to the possibility of a secession of some Dioceses, if the present name of the American Church is altered, that is for an American, and an American only, to deal with. Although that threat, because it is a threat, veiled though it be, is one that sounds oddly in an Englishman's ears.

The difficulty of choosing a true and suitable name seems very great to Professor Nelson, yet it is hard to conceive that there would be much difficulty in making a selection if the General Convention were really desirous and eager for a change. Professor Nelson tries to discredit not the adjectives which may designate a local branch of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, but the very word "Church." For a layman of the Church to be in doubt as to what is meant by "The Church" would speak very ill for the teaching of the priests who have been over him. For a priest of the Church to be in such doubt would be a confession of ignorance past and present, — *past*, since he promised always to minister the Doctrine, Sacraments, and Discipline as the American Church receives the same, — *present*, since he promised to banish and drive away from the Church all erroneous and strange doctrines.

For one not in communion with the Church to be in doubt as to what the Church is is perfectly natural, and to such an one you need a short answer. If he asks, "What Church?" the answer ought to be, "The Church of America." If the reply is, "That is a boastful title. Why do you call it THE Church

\* "Protestant," declined by Lower House of Convocation. [See Lathbury's *History of Convocation*, p. 331.]

of America," then ought to come the rejoinder, "A branch of God's Church must have three notes: 1. Succession of orders. 2. Succession of mission. 3. Succession of Doctrine. We, claiming to have all three, are therefore *The Church* of this land."

Such an answer would lead to investigation as to whether the claim of the American Church to be the Church of the land was a valid one, and whether she had in very truth the threefold succession she claims. Boldness is the best charity. If a man entering a railway station of New York were to ask which is the train for Chicago, would he thank a bystander for the information, "This is the non-Bostonian Illuminated Line?" If the American Church has the threefold succession, let her, in all charity to those outside her Communion, so designate herself that inquiring souls may be led to question, and questioning, receive such assurance as shall lead to belief.

The Church of Antioch or of Jerusalem did "not include," as Professor Nelson misstates, "all the followers of CHRIST in those respective cities" [*Church Review*, February, 1887, p. 179], but all those who were in communion with the Churches of Antioch or Jerusalem. The Church of Antioch, by express canons, excommunicated those Christians who "assembled in private houses and prayed with those who do not pray in the Church." [Canon 2, of the Canons of Antioch, A. D. 341.]

A bishop or a priest of the Church of Antioch who appealed to the Emperor without the consent of the Bishops of the Province "shall be publicly deposed, and cast out, not only from Communion, but also from the rank which he happens to have." [Canon 11, of the Canons of Antioch, A. D. 341.]

The Apostolic Canons include many pronouncing excommunications, or casting out of the Church, of Christians who disobeyed them. Consequently there must have been in every primitive Church persons who professed to be followers of CHRIST, but who yet were not included in the Church. To take one example out of many, Canon 30 decreed:—

If any Bishop, Priest, or Deacon shall have obtained his office for money, let both him and his ordainer be deposed, and let him be wholly cut off, as was Simon Magus.

In our days the deposed cleric would be reckoned within the pale of the Church. Formerly he was "wholly cut off," and

would certainly not be considered a member of the Church, or even by the Church a follower of CHRIST.

"The Church of America," or whatever name the American Church may choose for herself, would include not all the people of GOD in America, but all the people that were in communion with her.

"The Church of England" is not, as Professor Nelson says, "an Established Episcopal Church." She is the branch of the Catholic Church in England. She may be "established," whatever that may mean, but that has nothing to do with her as a Church. She certainly is Episcopal, else she could not be a branch of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church; but she is as much Presbyterian, or Baptist, or Second Adventist as she is Episcopal, and no more. In very truth she is more Presbyterian than the Presbyterians, as she has priests; more Baptist than the Baptists, as no unbaptised person can be a member of her; more Adventist than the Second Adventists, for, apart from calling on her clergy to preach on the second Advent for four weeks in the year, she enjoins on all, lay or cleric, a repetition twice a day at least of the belief that CHRIST shall come again to judge the quick and the dead.

The Church of Scotland is not the Presbyterian Kirk, but that branch of the Catholic Church which styles herself "The Episcopal Church in Scotland," and the Church of England disregards completely any other Church of Scotland, even if it be "Established." The translation of Bishop Tower to Gibraltar proved, if proof was needed, the belief of the Church of England. How a priest of that Church which owes her first bishop to the Scottish Church can print over his name an article containing the statement that the Church of Scotland is an Established Presbyterian Church is a marvel. Nor does he mean the words Church of Scotland in a legal sense, but in a Church sense; for the statements arise from the query he supposes an uninformed person to ask, "what Church?"

That the Church of England never recognised by Canon the Presbyterian Kirk as the Church of Scotland has, we trust, been made sufficiently clear in the article on that subject. [*Church Review*, April, 1887.] Nor would that matter be reverted to again had the following notes on the Tulchan Episcopate reached the Editor's hands in time for insertion in the last article.

It is assuredly needless to assert that by Episcopacy the Canonical and not the Titular Episcopacy is meant. It is perfectly true that there was a system of so-called "Bishops," known as the Titular or Tulchan \* Episcopate, instituted in 1571. These Tulchan Bishops were laymen having in their possession such of the revenues of their Sees as had escaped the plunder of the temporalities at the dissolution of the Roman hierarchy. These men "were merely nominal Bishops, for political and party purposes, unconsecrated, and of no higher authority than their lay preachers." A vain and futile system; that it was no Episcopacy at all, or so only in name — that the "consecration" of Douglas and others by unauthorised men, one of whom was a layman, was disgraceful, outrageous, and most sinful, Lawson elsewhere rightly asserts. [Lawson's *Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution*, p. 112.]

These straw bishops were repeatedly, however, attacked by the General Assemblies, and even abolished by them in two successive Assemblies, those of April 24 and June 11, 1578. The attacks against the Tulchan system were undoubtedly aimed through it against the Canonical Hierarchy everywhere. James, however, shrewdly saw that these *simulacra* of bishops would aid his turn in giving living bishops to his country. He foresaw well enough that it would be easier, if the temporal rights were in some measure preserved, to add the spiritual. This comes out clearly in his letter to the Assembly of 1610, which ratified the establishment of Episcopacy. He writes, on May 6: —

The King, therefore, to put a stop to this evil (a headless government) which had *otherwise proved an incurable cancer*, had assisted in person at several Assemblies, had provided a maintenance for ecclesiastics, and recovered their jurisdiction from the encroachments of the Laity. These things considered, his majesty hoped that the Church, being sensible of their errors in suffering the late Anarchy in their body, would have made their application to him establishing the Ecclesiastical Government upon the Primitive model. [Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, London, 1714, vol. ii. p. 700, with above italics.]

Apart from the Acts of Assemblies and Parliaments affecting the privileges of bishops, he took action in bringing about

\* "A sobriquet derived from the practice then prevalent of stuffing a calf skin with straw and placing it before a cow to induce the animal to give milk, which figure was called a tulchan." [Lawson's *Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution*, p. 112.]

the imposition of hands at ordinations, the permanent residence of the ministers, and in such comparatively minor matters as the solemnisation of matrimony, and the delay of baptism to infants.

The King drew up fifty articles by way of questions to be submitted to the Assembly at Perth of 1597.

The sixth is, "Is he a lawful minister who had no imposition of hands at his ordination?" The Presbyterian ministers were not a little embarrassed by the questions, and "to find the Church government mooted, which had been all along pretended no less than part of the Gospel, was a severe mortification. To prevent the progress of this controversy, or any unserviceable impressions on the people, all imaginary precaution was used, and several private consultations held for this purpose." [Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, London, 1714, vol. ii. p. 656.]

Several of the articles were agreed upon, but it was not until the Assembly at Dundee that the principal questions were agreed upon between the King and the Assembly, and, after allowing the interposition of the King in all important affairs, the second clause of the agreement was: "2. That the form for ordaining ministers shall be uniform, and none pass without Imposition of Hands, and being tied to a particular congregation. And that those unordained shall not be permitted to preach in private houses, unless upon urgent necessity and where regular ministers can't be had," etc. [Collier, vol. ii. p. 657.]

As to matrimony and the delay of baptism to infants, this is what Collier says, under date of November, 1601:—

The King having a near prospect of being monarch of the whole Island, and resolving to bring the Churches of England and Scotland towards an uniformity, prevailed with the Assembly to pass an order that marriages might be solemnised without distinction of days, whereas by the Rules of the Discipline it stood prohibited on Sundays. Further, before this time the initiating sacrament was not administered unless at the times of preaching. Some are of opinion this practice proceeded from an opinion of the indifferency, or at least the non-necessity of Baptism. But now the Assembly ordained: 'That in case this Sacrament was required by the parents, or those in their names, it should **neither** be refused to Infants, nor delayed upon any pretence whatsoever.' And thus the Scotch ministers made somewhat of an advance towards the Church of England. [Collier, vol. ii. p. 668.]

Little by little, step by step, James was bringing the Kirk into conformity with the Church of England. Imposition of hands, which Knox had vehemently rejected, was restored. The wandering of the ministers, which had been one of the cardinal points of the organisation (for even the superintendents had not to reside for more than three or four months in a place [Collier, vol. ii. p. 468]), was abolished, and the ministers tied to one congregation; the rite of matrimony restored to somewhat of its dignity, and the necessity of infant baptism insisted on; the Titular Bishops maintained. To crown the edifice, all that was wanted was the Apostolic Succession, without which there could be no Canonical Episcopacy, no effectual imposition of hands, or priestly blessing at Holy Matrimony.

When we talk of Presbyterianism being established in 1592, such establishment must be understood in a very modified sense. For the Act of 1592, while ratifying and approving the General Assemblies appointed by the Kirk and making their proceedings legal, yet nowhere declared even the Titular Episcopacy illegal. Practically it created a Titular Priesthood. Their priests, or, as they chose to call them, their presbyters, are as much men of straw as their Bishops, in the eyes of the Church. The act gave a legal status to the Presbytery, but the Titular Bishops still continued to sit and vote in Parliament. And the Act of 1597, as we have seen [*Church Review* for April, 1887, p. 439. See, also, Lawson, pp. 235-241], expressly maintains their right of voting, and, further, empowers the King to create Bishops, Abbots, or Prelates, to have the same rights as Ecclesiastical Prelates had at any time bygone.

Legally speaking, then, Presbytery, as existing apart from any kind of Episcopacy, was, if established at all by the Act of 1592, abrogated by the Act of 1597. A Titular Priesthood and a Titular Episcopacy were then both legally in existence.

The present Kirk ought to be grateful to James, for he certainly prevented her from throwing away every shred of Apostolic teaching or Christian doctrine. The better part of the Presbyterian discipline as now in existence in Scotland is undoubtedly the creation of James, for it was owing to him that the godless and chaotic system of Knox was overthrown. When Episcopacy was cast aside by the Kirk in 1638, and then for the first time declared illegal, the foundation James had raised was not disturbed. This does not prove that James considered

the Ecclesiastic edifice complete before he restored the Apostolic Succession. As well might a man argue that the architects of Cologne Cathedral considered their work completed because they had not capped the edifice with the spires. He undoubtedly at various times spoke well of the Kirk,\* though it is curious to note his expressions, they mostly have a double meaning, yet withal he persevered with all the obstinacy of a Stuart in the prosecution of his cherished plan of restoring the Canonical Episcopate to Scotland; nor was he backward in honoring those who had helped him in his restoration of the Episcopal Order in Scotland.†

Having done all that he could legally do for the restoration of Episcopacy, James could do no more. He could not obtain consecration for his bishops without applying to Elizabeth. A refusal from her would have rendered the position still more difficult. Knowing that, humanly speaking, he might succeed the aged Queen any day, he preferred to wait till he became king of both countries.

On Elizabeth's death the petition, so vaingloriously but falsely called the "millenary" petition, was got up under pretense of asking for a few reforms in the Prayer Book, but really striking at the Apostolic Priesthood and Episcopacy. To consider it, James summoned the Hampton Court Conference. This met January, 1604, two months before Convocation. At the King's opening speech he said, "That by the blessing of Providence he was *brought into the promised land*, where Religion was possessed in its purity," and "owned that the present Ecclesiastical government to have been plainly countenanced by Heaven." [Collier, vol. ii. p. 673, with same italics.] And during the second day's conference, "The king reflected on S. Jerome for affirming Bishops were not of Divine Institution, and closed

\* The speech of the King which Presbyterians cite most is the one to the General Assembly of 1590, where he thanked GOD "he was king in such a Kirk, the sincerest Kirk in the world," ending with a sneer at the Kirk of England as an "ill-paid mass, wanting nothing but the liftings." This speech is always by them taken from the account given by Calderwood, a zealous Presbyterian, who was *not* present, and never from the account given by Spotswood, who *was* present, because Spotswood's account of the King's speech *does not contain any allusion to the Church of England at all!*

† George Home "is mentioned as the person on whom the King most depended for the restoration of the Episcopal Order in Scotland." He was created a peer of England, and raised to the Earldom of Dunbar in the Scotch peerage. [Lawson, vol. ii. p. 276.]

the remark with this maxim, 'No Bishop, No King.'" [Collier, vol. ii. p. 677.]

Having in remembrance the so-called bishops that had been created in Scotland, it might be argued that perhaps the King had not very clear notions as to what constituted a bishop, that he considered them mere king-made puppets, although any one reading the account of the Conference will rise from that perusal with a strengthened conviction of the sound knowledge the King had of Church doctrine, and that he knew very well what he was about when he forced the Scottish Assemblies to take the successive steps they did for the restoration of a Canonical Episcopate; or, as the Presbyterian writers term it, "Hatching this woeful Episcopacy."

Still it had been asserted that the King believed he could make bishops. When, after the breaking up of the Assembly of 1610, the King sent for the three titular bishops whom he now designed to make real bishops of, we read that on their arrival at Court,—

The King, opening the business for which they were ordered hither, acquainted them that, at a great expense, he had recovered the bishoprics out of foreign hands and bestowed them upon such as he hoped would acquit themselves well in that station. But since he could not make them bishops, neither could they assume the honor to themselves; and that in Scotland there was not enough of that order to manage a canonical consecration, for these reasons he had called them into England, that being consecrated themselves they might propagate the character and ordain at home. That by this expedient the adversaries might be effectually silenced who gave out that he took upon him to make bishops and bestow spiritual offices. But this report was altogether aspersion, for that he had not done anything of this kind, nor would he ever presume to go thus far; and that he acknowledged such an authority belonged to none but our blessed Saviour and those commissioned by Him. [Spotswood's *History*, p. 514, as quoted by Collier, vol. ii. p. 701.]

Before the consecration a difficulty arose as to whether the bishops ought to consecrate Spotswood, Hamilton, and Lamb as bishops without their having been first ordained to the Diaconate and Priesthood. Andrews, Bishop of Ely, maintained that they ought certainly to be ordained priests, as they had not been ordained by a bishop. Spotswood tells us, in his history, that Bancroft replied that "where Bishops could not be had, orders

given by Presbyters must be reckoned lawful." It is very doubtful indeed whether Bancroft said this ; it is certainly contrary to his sermon at S. Paul's Cross in 1589, which Canon Perry and Professor Nelson have referred to, where he boldly stated that to maintain the parity of priests and bishops was to revive the Arian \* heresy. The same Bancroft was the President of the Convocation, 1604-10, which, as we have seen in the previous article, passed the Canons of 1604, which are so strong against Presbyterianism.† Dr. Andrews's views are also well known, and that such a reply should have satisfied him, even if Bancroft had made it, is most improbable. Besides, on such a matter there must necessarily have been considerable discussion, and Heylin's account is much more likely to be the true one, as it is just what we would have expected it to have been. Spotswood, we must also not forget, is an interested witness, as he was one of the men about to be consecrated bishops.

Collier says :—

But, after all, as the learned Heylin represents the matter, Bancroft went upon a much more defensible principle : he argued there was no necessity the Scotch bishops should pass through the intermediate Orders of deacon and priest, for that the Episcopal character might be fully conveyed at a single consecration ; and for this he cited some considerable precedents in the ancient Church. [*Heylin's History of Presbyterianism*, p. 387 ; Collier, vol. ii. p. 702.]

The consecration of S. Ambrose to the Bishopric of Milan, though a layman, is a well-known case and to the point.

When we have two differing accounts of the same matter, the probabilities of which is the correct one must be taken into account. If two writers were to publish now different accounts

\* Arians. An Arian and Presbyterian sect of the fourth century, formed about 360-370 A. D. by Arius of P. ntus or Armenia Minor. After quarrelling with his Bishop (Eustathius), Arius affirmed himself to be Eustathius's equal, and said there was no difference by the word of God betwixt a bishop and a priest. He left the Church, allured followers, and formed a sect. Besides denying the Episcopal order, the Arians objected to prayers for the dead, rejected the Church's regulations and times of fasting. "They gloried," Epiphanius says, "in fasting on the LORD'S Day." See Blunt's *Dictionary Sects and Heresies*. It is remarkable how closely the Presbyterians have imitated the Arians in all the above points, even to enjoining fasts on the Sunday.

† In the Canons which the same Convocation drew up and passed (but which did not receive the royal assent because the King thought the first of them dealt too freely with the royal prerogative). Canon 7 solemnly declares that the denial of Episcopal government "proceeds from none other than the wicked spirit." [*Overalls' Convocation Book*, 1690, pp. 191-194.]

of a conversation with Dr. Pusey on the validity of Anglican Orders, would the public accept as the correct one that account which should state that Dr. Pusey had maintained that the Church of England had no valid Orders? Yet those who would have us accept Spotswood's account of Dr. Bancroft's statements are asking a similar concession from us. The truth lies, perhaps, in accepting both accounts, those of Spotswood and Heylin; and that, after much discussion, it was then decided to take the case of S. Ambrose and others as a precedent to consider that the greater included the less and proceed with the consecration.\*

The extreme Presbyterians, who had been watching with alarm "the hatching of this woeful Episcopacy," seized the opportunity, when the Commission of Union for the two kingdoms was appointed by the Scotch Parliament of 1604 (which was sitting simultaneously with the Parliament and Convocation in London), to insert a clause in the Commission of Union, "expressly securing, in the event of its accomplishment, their system in doctrine and discipline; *but this was successfully resisted by several of the nobility who were anxious to promote the views of the sovereign.*" [Lawson, p. 269.]

So the Presbyterian writers themselves assert, and they ought to know. This proves, if proof were needed, that the King's plans were well known not only at the time of the passing of Canon 55, but before it.

It is a mere quibble, then, to say that the Church in Scotland was not a true Episcopal Church at the time of the passing of the Canons of 1604. It was so in intention as much as the Church of England in America before 1784 or 1789 was Episcopal. The bishops were nominated, though their consecration was not effected till some years after. The Convocation knew of this intention; and while, as we have seen, they condemned Presbyterians as *ipso facto* excommunicated, the Church in Scotland was recognised as Episcopal in will, and as shortly to become so in the fulness of a threefold consecration.

Is the Diocese of Easton Presbyterian? or was the American Church Presbyterian before the consecration of Bishops Seabury, White, and Provoost?

\* Who were accordingly consecrated by the Bishops of London, Ely, Rochester, and Worcester, and are described in the Register as John Spotswood, Minister and Concionator, consecrated Archbishop of Glasgow; Gawen Hamilton, Minister and Concionator, consecrated Bishop of Galloway; and Andrew Lamb, Minister and Concionator, consecrated Bishop of Brichen.

The last objection that is urged against the possibility of finding a suitable name if the present one is altered is the adaptation of Whateley's objection to "Roman Catholic" to the name of "American Catholic Church," and that objection for once we will admit to be well taken, and not so much for Whateley's reason that it would be a limitation of the word Catholic, and really mean "the particular universal church," but on account of the use of the word Church on the title-page of the American Prayer Book.

"The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

The words "the Church" of course \* refers to the Catholic Church; and to insert afterwards, "according to the use of the American Catholic Church," would not be very felicitous, in the writer's humble judgment.

When our LORD addressed the Angels or Bishops of his Churches, he called the Churches as "the Church of Ephesus," † "the Church in Sardis," "the Church in Laodicea," and not the "Protestant Episcopal Church of Ephesus," although there were need enough of strong protestants against the errors of the Nicolaitanes, and it certainly was an Episcopal Church.

Here, it would seem, in this nomenclature sanctioned by the Head of the Church, we have a guide how to call the various national branches of His Church. By analogy, therefore, the branch of CHRIST's Church, wherever she is in the United States of America, ought to be called "The Church of America," or "The Church in America," and if "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States" believes that she is that Church, then she should not be ashamed to confess her Master by calling herself by her right name, even though the world sneer at her, and even though she be in the minority. When our LORD addressed his Epistle to the Church of Ephesus, were the members of that Church in a minority or majority as regards the population and their beliefs?

It is easy to see why many earnest men, deploring the ten-

\* On re-reading this it occurs to the writer that perhaps Professor Nelson will consider that it is not "of course," and will ask, "What Church?"

† That is according to our translation, although the best readings point to the correct translation being "in Ephesus." For the sake of argument, however, it does not matter which rendering we take, *in* or *of*.

dency to negation so prevalent in these times, should be eager to assert in some unmistakable manner the Catholicity of the American Church, and should therefore desire to replace the word "Protestant" by the word "Catholic." Such we conceive would be an unfortunate use of the word, but might it not figure on the title-page as follows: *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Catholic Church, according to the Use of the Church of (or in) America.*

The insertion of the word "Catholic" as above would be but explanatory of the real meaning of the words "the Church." It would emphasise in a most marked manner that the Sacraments, Rites, and Ceremonies of the American Church are not her own invention, but are her common heritage as a daughter of the Catholic Church, while all that would be local would be her use, or usage of them. Such a solution of the question is put forth diffidently, and only because it could be defended on Scriptural and primitive grounds.

Returning now to Professor Nelson and his article. Continuing his comments on the unsuitability of changing the name, he makes a great point of the funds which support, wholly or in part, one fourth of the clergy of the Dioceses of Arkansas, Quincy, Springfield, and Tennessee as being contributions "*of the Protestant Episcopal* (italics are the Professor's) *Church*" in other Dioceses.

Why of course they must be. From what other Church could they come from? So long as "Protestant Episcopal" form part of the legal title of the American Church, so long do these words form part of her title. *Cela va sans dire.*

But it is very curious that that distributing body which could change its name has discarded the words "Protestant Episcopal," and calls itself "The American Church Missionary Society," although judging from its advertisement [*The Spirit of Missions* for March, 1887, Advertisements, p. 6] it appears to have a suspiciously party organisation; and such is the inconsistency of human nature, this very Society is blaming, if newspaper reports are correct, those who would do what she has already done, and while the first to seek relief in a short and simple title, objects that the Church she calls "American," and which she professes to serve, should follow her example and likewise drop the words "Protestant Episcopal," and call her-

self the Church in America, or the American Church. Inconsistency and party spirit could go no farther.

When the Protestant Episcopal Church has, as lately,\* to be rendered into Latin (*pace* Professor Nelson), she becomes "*Ecclesia Americana*." Here is a grand chance for some person to protest on the ground that it is an untrue designation, and that some "uninformed" stranger, reading the inscription hereafter, will ask, "What Church?"

Professor Nelson then enters into the arithmetical argument, which is not a very evangelical one, and proceeds to bewail the fact that where the "Church idea" prevails as in Arkansas, Quincy, Springfield, and Tennessee, they have not quite eleven hundred communicants and one hundred and twenty-seven clergy altogether.

What does the good Professor mean by the "Church idea"? Have they no ideas about the Church in Virginia? Remembering that the four Dioceses selected are new ones, comparatively speaking, the showing is not so bad in comparison to the old established Diocese of Virginia. The number of communicants in the four Dioceses is ten thousand five hundred and fifty against twenty-six thousand one hundred and twenty-six individuals. In Virginia the communicants are fifteen thousand three hundred and eighty-one against thirty-one thousand six hundred and twenty-six individuals. [These figures are taken from the *Living Church Annual*, 1887 and 1888.]

Having made this preliminary survey of the difficulties attendant upon any change, the Professor settles down to work, and brings forward his three main objections.

"The first objection to our calling ourselves by any one of the proposed names is that we thereby assert what is not true."

To that of course we cannot reply. A priest of the American Church ought to know better than one outside of it whether any of the names suggested would be false names. The only names that he gives as having been suggested are "The Church of

\* The East window of S. Andrews, Aberdeen, erected to the memory of Bishop Seabury, American Churchmen largely contributing, has the following inscription:—

Ad Dei majorem gloriam  
et in piam memoriam  
Samuel Seabury, qui, in hac urbe Episcopus  
consecratus MDCLXXIV,  
Primus Ecclesiæ Americanæ præfuit.  
Obiit 1796.

America," "the American Catholic Church," "the Church in the United States."

If, of course, a General Convention should decide that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States is not the Church of America, or the Church in the United States, or even the American Catholic Church, and that to call her by any of those names would be to call her by a lying name, why then, and only when that happens, shall we agree with Professor Nelson when he says that to call her by any of the proposed names would be an assertion of what *is not true*.

The second objection is the one that has called forth this article, and we give it in full. If we have been somewhat long in coming to the point it is simply because the whole drift of Professor Nelson's article is to lead up to this objection of his. It is his *cheval de bataille*, and if it falls the whole article falls.

Here is, then, the second objection, word for word, italics and all, so far as it implicates the Church of England :—

A second objection is that this proposed change is a deliberate effort to force upon this Church *the theory of the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination as the sole view to be tolerated and taught therein*. The whole argument of the writer in the *Review* is based on the assumption that we are *the only* Church of CHRIST, and that none are workers for CHRIST outside of this Church, that out of it there is no salvation, that unless we proclaim this 'we jeopardise millions of souls' and 'shut CHRIST's kingdom against millions of men.' Such a position implies utter oblivion of the facts of history. The theory of the *exclusive* validity of any one form of Church government was, so far as the Reformers are concerned, conceived and born of Presbyterianism, and one great object of Hooker's immortal work was to show that the Scriptures nowhere lay down any one form of polity to which the Church is forever bound. Canon Perry will not be considered partial to the Low Churchmen, and yet he writes :—

'There is a wide difference between the school of Whitgift and Hooker and that of Bilson, Hall, and Laud. At first all that was contended for was that Episcopacy was permissible and not against the Scriptures, that it was a Church government ancient and allowable. So Jewell, Whitgift, and others, but they did not venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the Sacraments. The first public setting forth of this doctrine was in Bancroft's sermon at S. Paul's Cross, A. D. 1588. The first broaching of this doctrine was due to Saravia, a Spanish divine from the Low Countries, who published a treatise on the ministry about A. D. 1590.

The learned Hooker, in spite of the attempts of his excellent editor (Keble) to saddle him with the doctrine by implication, cannot be shown to have held that Episcopacy was indispensable to a Church.\*

He might have added that Hooker expressly repudiated it; and that even Bancroft said that where Bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the Presbyters must be esteemed lawful; and that Saravia, whilst writing: '*Bishops I consider to be necessary to the Church,*' also writes: '*Presbyters can in case of necessity ordain a Presbyter.*'

'The *Divine right* of Episcopacy has always been and always will be an open question in the Church of England. Writers of great name and note are found on either side. Hooker, Field, and Stillingfleet stand ranged against Bilson, Hall, and Hammond. The Preface to the *Ordinal* is evidently open to an interpretation which will suit either view, and it seems impossible to prove that the Church has made any authoritative declaration on the subject.' †

He might have added that the majority of the most eminent men, even among those whom he named, whilst advocating the Apostolic origin and Divine right of Episcopacy, disclaimed its exclusive validity, and recognised as *Churches* Christian Communities which did not possess it. Bishop Andrewes writes in 1618:—

'Though our government be by Divine right, it follows not, either that there is "no salvation," or that "a Church cannot stand without it." He must needs be stone blind, that sees not Churches standing without it; he must be made of iron and hard-hearted, that denies them salvation.' ‡

Even Laud, although in 1604 'he maintained there could be no true Church without Diocesan Bishops, for which Dr. Holland, then Doctor of the chair, *openly reprehended him in the Schools for a seditious person, who would unchurch the Reformed Protestant Churches beyond seas, and now sow division between us and them, who were brethren, by this NOVEL POPISH POSITION,*' §—even Laud, about 1624, writes, 'I do not find any one of the ancient fathers that makes *local, personal, visible, and continued succession* a necessary mark of the true Church in any one place. . . . Most evident it is that the succession which the fathers meant is not tied to *place or person*, but it is tied to *verity of doctrine.*' || Bishop Hall, also, mentioned above by Perry, who wrote a strong defence of the *Divine right* of Episcopacy as an *Apostolical* institution, says, 'When we speak of *Divine right*, we mean not an

\* Perry, *History of the Church of England from the Reign of Elizabeth*, vol. i. pp. 19, 20.

† *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 162.

‡ Quoted from Goode's *Divine Rule*, vol. ii. p. 298.

§ *Ibid.*

|| *Conference with Fisher*, Oxford edition, pp. 322-324.

express law of God, requiring it upon the absolute necessity of the being of a Church . . . ; those particular Churches\* to whom this power and faculty is denied lose nothing of the true essence of a Church, though they miss something of their glory and perfection.\* 'There is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. . . . The only difference is in the form of outward administration ; wherein also we are so far agreed as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a Church.'† So a host of the ablest men of the Church of England, beginning with those who compiled her liturgy and Articles, and including those who have most strongly advocated the Divine right of Episcopacy, might be shown, if space permitted, to have taken pains to prove that they did *not* hold the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination.

Professor Nelson then goes on to "find, moreover, that those who organised the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States did not accept this theory," which is a curious comment on the Seabury Centenary Commemoration yet fresh in our minds. If the organisers of the American Church did not hold the theory of the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination, why in the name of common sense did they in the face of popular opinion meet by stealth to elect candidates for consecration to the Episcopal Order? Why did Dr. Seabury further spend a whole year trying to allay the then Archbishop of Canterbury's political fears, and then finally reopen negotiations with the despised and scanty remnant of the Church of Scotland? If Presbyterian "ordination" was as good as Episcopal ordination, why should the organisers of the American Church have been so determined to secure the Apostolic Succession for their infant Church?

Even if these "organisers" should have been so curiously constituted as to seek with difficulty for that which they did not hold as essential to their continued existence as a Church, and to have held private opinions belied by their public conduct, all this would be of no moment when once the American Church had herself spoken officially. And that she has so spoken it is evident unto all men who read the preface to her Ordinal, copied textually from the preface to the Ordinal of the Church of England. This part of Professor Nelson's article touching on the History and Voice of the American Church can well be left to the tender mercies of American Churchmen.

\* *Works*, vol. x. p. 282. Oxford edition. 1837.

† *Ibid.* vol. vii. p. 58.

Examining the first part of his second objection to the proposed change, as quoted at length above, we find that in his endeavor to controvert the, to him, objectionable "*theory of the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination as the sole view to be tolerated and taught therein*," he asserts that "such a position implies utter oblivion to the facts of history," and strives to show that the *Divine right* of Episcopacy has always been and always will be an open question in the Church of England.

At the outset he endeavors to prejudice the case of those who advocate the change of name, and the Hon. L. Bradford Prince in particular, as the writer of the articles in the *Church Review* for November and December, 1886, by stating that the whole argument of Judge Prince "is based on the assumption that we are the *only* Church of CHRIST," that none are workers for CHRIST outside of this Church; that out of it there is no salvation; that unless we proclaim this "we jeopardise millions of souls" and "shut Christ's Kingdom against millions of men."

Such a summary of Judge Prince's article is unfair. What Judge Prince contends for is, to quote his own words:—

I insist that, as stewards, we have no right to conceal the character of the Church, placed for a brief generation in our charge, and thus jeopardise millions of souls. I insist that the shutting of CHRIST'S Kingdom against our fellowmen, by preventing their recognising it, or even knowing of its existence, is as grievous a wrong as if by any other means we stopped them from using the means of salvation provided by our LORD. And I insist that it is our bounden duty, as far as in us lies, to direct the steps of all men to the Church, and to place over her portals her name so unmistakably written that it will draw the attention of every creature, and leave no doubt in his mind, that it is the Church of the living God. [*Church Review* for December, 1886, p. 583.]

His is a perfectly legitimate contention on the part of an American Churchman, for unless the American Church is *the* branch of CHRIST'S Holy Catholic Apostolic Church having the threefold succession of Orders, Mission, and Doctrine in America, she is nothing but a sect, and every clergyman and congregation that prays to be delivered from "all false doctrine, heresy, and schism," is reciting an unmeaning, if it is not a hypocritical petition.

When the hymn, "The Church's One Foundation," is sung, let them leave out as some sectaries rightly and consistently do the lines,—

By schisms rent asunder,  
By heresies distrest.\*

Judge Prince, however, nowhere takes upon himself to limit God's mercies by saying positively, "That none are workers for CHRIST outside of this Church, that out of it there is no salvation." He pleads for a right name, just as a man of science would plead for an accurate definition, or just as an engineer would plead for a right signal on a railway line lest millions might be jeopardised by a confusing signal. Where is the lack of charity in this? The train may reach its destination safely, even though the signals be confusing, but is there no responsibility on those who put up the confusing signal? "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound who shall prepare himself to the battle?" is the Apostolic warning for the day. [Second Lesson, Even Song, March 23.]

VOICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

If the reader will make a careful examination of the quotation given at length above (and given at much length for the reason that the more Professor Nelson appears to say on the subject of the Voice of the Church of England the less accurate are his statements, or the deductions he makes from the quotations he gives), the reader will perceive that the statements of the Professor can be reduced under three heads.

I. That the theory of the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination is not the sole view to be tolerated and taught in the Church of England, nor are the validity of the sacraments to be connected with the succession, and that this theory dates from 1588.

II. "The Divine right of Episcopacy has always been, and always will be, an open question in the Church of England."

III. "That a host of the ablest men of the Church of England, beginning with those who have compiled her Liturgy and Articles, and including those who have most strongly advocated the Divine right of Episcopacy, might be shown, if space permitted, to have taken pains to prove that they did not hold the exclusive validity of Episcopal ordination." And, either directly

\* In the opening services of a reformed Episcopal Church in Chicago, last October, the hymn, "The Church's One Foundation," was sung. The hymn was printed in the programme of the services, but the verse containing, "By schisms rent asunder," was omitted. [*Living Church*, December 4, 1886.]

or indirectly by quotations from Canon Perry, James Hooker, Whitgift, Bancroft, Saravia, Field, Stillingfleet, Bilson, Hall, Hammond, Andrews, Laud, and a certain Doctor Holland.

The first heading embodies the claim that Professor Nelson puts forward, quoting, to support his view, Canon Perry. As if to disarm hostility he states before quoting from the Canon's book, "Canon Perry will not be considered partial to the Low Churchmen, and yet he writes." . . . This recommendatory reference is delicious, and suggests to one's mind the following fable:—

A Fox and a Wolf one day set out to visit a Fold. As they approached they met a Sheep who started in affright at their aspect. Whereon the Fox, blandly advancing bonnet in hand:

'Madam, allow me to introduce Master Wolf,' and aside, whispered behind his hand, 'Compose your alarm, 't is no friend of mine. He is very partial to young lambs, I assure you.'

'It may be so, good Sir, but yonder cometh the Shepherd; let him speak for him and thee,' replied the Sheep, and so regained the Fold.

It is perfectly immaterial what Canon Perry calls himself, or is considered to be, and much as the Church may reverence the memories of Laud or Pusey, she certainly would not be bound by any statements they have put forward. Canon Perry may be a very dutiful son of the Church, yet if he puts forward a statement that is false, his putting it forward will not make it true. Not being able to refer to a copy of his history, it is impossible to see how far the context, or other parts, may qualify the quotations Professor Nelson gives from his work. An appeal must therefore be made to the same tribunal to which even Canon Perry has to go, that of history. By history is meant not the gloss on history, but historical facts.

Canon Perry is quoted as saying, —

At first all that was contended for was that Episcopacy was permissible and not against the Scriptures, that it was a Church government ancient and allowable.

Quite so. This is the apologetic side of a controversy, and very useful it is to present that side. If a preacher, in urging the claims of the Church on the consideration of a congregation of Baptists or Presbyterians, took the ground that it was safer, as a mere matter of precaution, to be inside the Church than out of it, would the preacher be held to have committed himself

to the point that there was nothing else to be said in favor of the Church?

Remembering the position of the Reformers, pressed to prove the right of existence of their Church apart from the Papacy, on the one hand, and assailed on the other side by the irreconcilables and nihilists of the day, is it wonderful that they should have desired to conciliate rather than offend the moderate men among the Protestants; and that, while they fiercely controverted every point of the accretions to the Faith, they should have been apologetic with those of the reformed who had not actually declared against the doctrines and Orders of their Church, and thus endeavor to win them over to their side in the contest with Rome?

We know, as having that wisdom of posterity which consists in being wise after the event, that it was a vain hope, but the Reformers could not see that. It certainly lacks gracefulness, if not gratitude, for the present successors of the Puritans, Presbyterians, and Presbyterians of those days to blame the Reformers for their moderation.

Passing over the reference to Hooker, Whitgift, Bilson, Laud, Hall, and Jewell as coming under the third head of our argument, we come to the statement of fact, which is the essential one of the whole paragraph quoted from Canon Perry's work, if not indeed of the whole article by Professor Nelson:—

So, Jewell, Whitgift, and others, but they did not venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the Sacraments. *The first public setting forth* of this doctrine was in Bancroft's sermon at S. Paul's Cross, A. D. 1588. 'The first broaching of this doctrine was due to Saravia, a Spanish divine from the Low Countries, who published a treatise on the ministry about A. D. 1590.

Whatever the distinction may be between "the first broaching of a doctrine" and the "first setting forth of it," we take the first date, and proceed to appeal to historical facts as to whether the first public setting forth of the doctrine that Episcopacy was indispensable to a Church, and the connection of that doctrine with the validity of the sacraments, was really subsequent to the date of Bancroft's sermon.

If Professor Nelson will excuse the liberty, we will correct Canon Perry first as to the date of Bancroft's sermon. It was not in 1588, but in 1589. It was preached on February 9, being the Sunday next after the Houses of Parliament met, and in

### 318 *Episcopal Ordination and the Scottish Kirk.*

the February succeeding the dispersal of the Armada. [Soames' *Elizabethan Religious History*, Parker, 1839, p. 377.] Even Canons do not always hit the mark.

Now, about the novelty of the doctrine in 1588 or 1589. Of course, Canon Perry and Professor Nelson can only mean novel since the overthrow of Popery in England. Not novel in England or in the history of the Catholic Church throughout the world. Novel, in other words, in the Reformed Church of England.

Let us precise some dates for further reference : —

Papal supremacy abolished in England in 1534.

Accession of Edward VI, January 28,\* 1547.

Accession of Mary, July 6, 1553.

Accession of Elizabeth, November 17, 1558.

Accession of James, March 24, 1603.

If reference is made to the King's Articles of 1535, to the *Declaration of the Functions and Divine Institution of Bishops and Priests* of 1537, embodied in the *Institution of a Christian Man*, to the *De ordine et ministerio sacerdotum et Episcoporum* of 1538, to the *Necessary Doctrines and Erudition for a Christian Man* of 1543, or to other such public documents asserting the ministerial powers of dispensing the Sacraments, of conveying absolution, of binding and loosing ; in one word, the whole Sacramental system, the answer will be that the Reformed Church had not yet had time to clear herself from the defilement of Popery in the Eighth Henry's reign.

With only one reference to the reign of Edward VI, for fear of a like charge, we will pass on to the reign of Elizabeth, — Cranmer's *Catechism*, 1548, compiled by Justus Jonas, but deliberately adopted and translated by the Archbishop and constantly referred to by him as his own.

And so the ministration of GOD's word, which our LORD JESUS CHRIST did first institute, was derived from the Apostles unto others after them by imposition of hands, and giving the HOLY GHOST, from the Apostles' time to our days. And this was the consecration, Orders, and Unction of the Apostles, whereby they at the beginning made Bishops and Priests, and this shall continue in the Church even to the world's end, . . . wherefore, good children, you shall give due reverence and honor to the ministers of the Church . . . you shall take them

\* Some tables give the 29. At any rate he was proclaimed on the 31.

for GOD's ministers, and the messengers of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. For CHRIST himself saith in the Gospel, he that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me. Wherefore, good children, you shall steadfastly believe all those things which such ministers shall speak to you from the mouth, and by the Commandment of our LORD JESUS CHRIST. And whatsoever they do to you, as when they baptise you, when they give you absolution, and distribute to you the Body and Blood of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, these you shall so esteem, as if CHRIST himself, in His own Person, did speak and minister unto you. For CHRIST hath commanded His ministers to do this unto you, and He Himself (although you see Him not with your bodily eyes) is present with His ministers, and worketh by the HOLY GHOST in the administration of His Sacraments. And on the other side, you shall take good heed, and beware of false and privy preachers, which privily creep into cities, and preach in corners, having none authority, nor being called to this office. For CHRIST is not present with such preachers, and therefore doth not the HOLY GHOST work by their preaching, but their word is without fruit or profit, and they do great hurt in commonwealths. For such as be not called of GOD, they no doubt of it, do err, and sow abroad heresy and naughty doctrine. [Sermon on the Keys in Cranmer's *Catechism*, pp. 193 seq. Oxford, 1829.]

What an outcry there would be nowadays, of want of charity, exclusiveness, and unchurching other Churches, if the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Presiding Bishop were to put forth such a manual with such plain teaching on the Apostolical succession and the validity of the Sacraments and Absolution in connection therewith.

What a commentary on the English Ordinal by the very man who, it is said, wrote the Preface as it stood in the year 1588.

And even if Cranmer did not himself compose the Preface, he was the head of the commission which gave us the Ordinal of 1550.

In 1552 the Ordinal was revised, and several ceremonies and practices were omitted in the vain hope of conciliating the extreme wing, but no material alteration was made in the wording of the service, and no change made in the Preface.

It cannot, therefore, even be said that Cranmer had not the chance given him of qualifying the Ordinal or its Preface.

We come now to Elizabeth's reign, which commenced on November 17, 1558.

ARTHUR LOWNDES.

[*To be continued.*]

## LIFE, TIMES, AND CORRESPONDENCE OF BISHOP WHITE.

### CHAP. V.—MEASURES FOR ORGANISATION.

THE influence of William White in the measures taken for the organisation of the Church, after the return of peace, was more especially felt in Maryland and in Pennsylvania, the two States with which he was naturally the most closely connected by family and personal ties.

In Maryland, under the proprietary and colonial governments, the Church had been established by law, and upon the severance of the ties connecting Church and State by war the identity of the Church, under the name and title of "the Protestant Episcopal Church," with the mother Church of England, and its rights of property in the churches, chapels, glebes, and endowments of that mother Church, were duly recognised in the "Vestry Act" of 1779. There was for a time danger that the legislature might go farther than merely secure the Church's rights and property. So deeply was the Erastianism of the age ingrained in Churchmen and statesmen alike, that it was proposed in the Assembly, composed of men of different faiths and in many cases of no religious belief at all, to proceed to organise the Church by legislative enactment, and to appoint ordainers to the ministry.\* Happily, this extraordinary proposition attracted the attention of the wise and scholarly Samuel Keene, a clergyman of reputation and position, who hastened to Annapolis, and was heard before the House in opposition to the measure contemplated. His arguments were convincing, and the scheme was abandoned.

The temporal necessities of the various parishes induced action on the part of "a very considerable number of Vestries, wholly in their lay character," † in furtherance of a petition to

\* *Vide* Bishop White's *Memoirs of the Church*, second edition, p. 92.

† *An Address to the Members of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland*, containing an account of the Proceedings of some late Conventions both of clergy

the General Assembly of the State for the passage of a law for "the support of the Christian Religion," enabling any church-wardens and vestry "by rates on the pews from time to time or otherwise, . . . to repair the Church or Chapel, and the Church yard and Burying Ground of the same." The consideration of this petition was not pressed during the continuance of the war, but on the coming of peace the question of a religious establishment was brought before the Assembly in an address from the executive, warmly commending the provision of a "public support for the Ministers of the Gospel." A copy of this address came into the hands of a number of the clergy, assembled at the commencement of Washington College in May, 1783, who at once took steps for securing "a Council or Consultation" to consider "what alterations might be necessary in our Liturgy and Service; and how our Church might be organised and a succession of the Ministry kept up."\* The determinations arrived at by this Conference were at once communicated to Dr. White in the following interesting and informal letter, written by the moving spirit in all these measures, the Rev. Dr. William Smith:†

DEAR SIR, — The Clergy of Maryland are to meet (in Persuance of the Sanction obtained from the G. Assembly), on the 13th of this Month; but as Mr. Gates and myself were to call the Meeting, we found, on consulting some of our nearest Brethren, that they did not think it proper, nor that we were authorised, to call any Clergy to our assistance from the neighboring States — that the Episcopal Clergy of Maryland were in some Respects peculiarly circumstanced, and ought in the first Instance to have a preparatory Convention or Conference, to consider and frame a *Declaration* of these our Rights as one of the Churches of a Separate and Independent State, to agree upon some articles of Government and Unity among themselves, to fix some future Time of Meeting by adjournment, to appoint a Committee to bring in a Plan of *some few* Alterations that may be found necessary in the Liturgy and Service of the Church, and by the Authority of this first Meeting to open a Correspondence on the Subject with the Clergy of the Neighboring States, and to have some speedy Future and more general Meeting with the Clergy of those States or Committees from and laity, for the purpose of organising the said Church, and providing a Succession in her Ministry agreeably to the Principles of the American Revolution. Baltimore, 1784, 8vo, p. 17. This rare tract is reprinted in full in Perry's *Historical Notes and Documents*, pp. 14-33.

\* *An Address*, etc., p. 6.

† Perry's *Historical Notes and Documents*, p. 19.

them, to unite, if possible, in the Alterations to be made, which many among us think cannot have a full Church Ratification till we have, on some Plan or another, the three orders of Bishops, Priests and Deacons to concur in the same. What *State* or *Civil* Ratification may be necessary, or whether any, is a Question yet to be determined. In Maryland I presume a few words of a Declaratory Act, that a Clergy ordained in such a Form, and using a Liturgy with such Alterations as may be agreed upon, are to be considered as entitled to the Glebes, Churches, and other Property declared by the Constitution to belong to the *Church of England* forever. I say such a short act as this, or the Opinion of the Judges that such Act is not necessary, is, I conceive, all that will be wanted here.

I presume that we shall not sit at this time above Two Days. My Wife, my Daughter, and Son in Law, as soon as I return, will accompany me to Philadelphia, when I shall inform you of the Result of the Meeting, as I imagine you may not think it worth your while at this Season to visit Annapolis, unless your, and other, Assistance were at present desired. But if you should be so disposed, I beg you will take my House in your way. Several of the Clergy of this State are to meet me at Rockhall on Wednesday the 13th at 8 o'clock *mane* to cross over.

Will your Committee never do anything in my affairs? The Behaviour of your Board shows—shall I call it—*worse* and *worse* and *worse*? Pray write me by return of Post. You told me you never would be *doctored* where there was no *Divinity Faculty*, and you might have added by an *usurped* or *unconstitutional* Authority. But as I see you take your Titles, with a kind of *Congressional* Sanction, in an advertisement that you have read some part of Aitken's Bible, I have not with held them from you. Be not offended at a little Raillery on this Head from yours, etc., etc.

WM. SMITH.

CHESTER, Augst 4th, 1783.

P. S. — This Letter I desire to be only to yourself. It is written in a very hasty, unconnected way—bad Ink, bad everything—the Post waiting for it.

Rev'd Dr WHITE, Rector of Christ Church, etc.

To be sent by Penny Post, so as to have an answer by Return of Post.

The programme thus laid down was carefully followed. At the meeting of the Clergy thus authorised by the Assembly, besides the preparation of a draft of an act or charter of incorporation for adoption by the Legislature, the following "Declaration of fundamental rights and liberties" was unanimously agreed upon and subscribed. The original copy of this docu-

ment is preserved among the Smith MSS. in the archives of the General Convention. We give it in full as one of the most important, as it is one of the earliest, of our ecclesiastical "state papers":—

*A Declaration of certain fundamental Rights & Liberties of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland; had & made at a Convention or Meeting of the Clergy of said Church, duly assembled at Annapolis, August 13, 1783, agreeable to a vote of the General Assembly passed upon a petition presented in the Name and Behalf of the said Clergy.*

Whereas by the Constitution and Form of Government of this State 'all persons professing the Christian Religion are equally entitled to protection in their Religious Liberty, and no person by any Law (or otherwise) ought to be molested in his Person or Estate on account of his Religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice; unless, under Colour of Religion, any man shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the State, or shall infringe the Laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil or religious Rights;' And *Whereas* the ecclesiastical and *Spiritual Independence* of the different Religious Denominations, Societies, Congregations, and Churches of Christians in this State, necessarily follows from, or is included in, their *Civil Independence*.

Wherefore we the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland, (heretofore denominated the Church of England, as by Law established) with all duty to the Civil authority of the State, and with all Love and Good will to our Fellow Christians of every other Religious Denomination, do hereby declare, make known and claim the following as certain of the fundamental Rights and Liberties inherent, and belonging to the said *Episcopal Church*, not only of common Right, but agreeable to the express words, spirit and design of the Constitution & Form of Government aforesaid, viz—

1st. We consider it as the undoubted Right of the said Protestant Episcopal Church, in common with other Christian Churches under the American Revolution, to compleat and preserve herself as an *entire Church*, agreeable to her antient Usages and Profession; and to have the full enjoyment and free exercise of those purely *spiritual powers* which are essential to the Being of every Church or Congregation of the *faithful*; and which, being derived only from Christ and his Apostles, are to be maintained independent of every foreign or other Jurisdiction, so far as may be consistent with the Civil Rights of Society.

2d. That ever since the *Reformation*, it hath been the received Doctrine of the Church whereof we are members, (& which by the Constitution of this State is entitled to the perpetual enjoyment of certain

Property and Rights under the Denomination of the Church of England) that there be these three Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, and that an Episcopal Ordination and Commission are necessary to the Valid Administration of the Sacraments, & the due Exercise of the Ministerial Functions *in the said Church*.

3d. That, without calling in Question, or wishing the least Contest with any other Christian Churches or Societies, concerning their Rights, Modes and Forms, we consider and declare it to be an Essential Right of the Protestant Episcopal Church to have, & enjoy the Continuance of the said three Orders of Ministers for ever, so far as concerns matters purely Spiritual, & that no persons in the character of Ministers, except such as are in the Communion of the said Church and duly called to the ministry by regular Episcopal Ordination can or ought to be admitted into or enjoy any of "the Churches, Chapels, Glebes, or other Property" formerly belonging to the Church of England, in this State, & which by the Constitution and Form of Government is secured to the said Church for ever, by whatever Name she, the said Church, or her Superior Order of Ministers, may in future be denominated.

4th. That as it is the Right, so it will be the Duty, of the said Church, when duly organised, constituted and represented in a Synod or Convention of the different Orders of her ministry and People, to revise her Liturgy, Forms of Prayer & publick worship, in order to adopt the same to the late Revolution, & other local circumstances of America, which it is humbly conceived may and will be done, without any other or farther Departure from the Venerable Order and beautiful Forms of worship of the Church from whom we sprung, than may be found expedient in the Change of our situation from a *Daughter* to a *Sister* Church.

William Smith, President, St Paul's & Chester Parishes,  
Kent County.

John Gordon, St Michael's, Talbot.

John MacPherson, Wm and Mary Parish, Charles County.

Samuel Keene, Dorchester Parish, Dorchester County.

Wm West, St Paul's Parish, Baltimore County.

Wm Thomson, St Stephen's, Cecil County.

Walter Magowan, St James's Parish, Ann Arundel County.

John Stephen, All Faith Parish, St Mary's County.

Thos Jno Claggett, St Paul's Parish, Prince George's County.

George Goldie, King & Queen, Saint Mary's County.

Joseph Messenger, St Andrew's Parish, St Mary's County.

John Bowie, St Peter's Parish, Talbot County.

Walter Harrison, Durham Parish, Charles County.

W<sup>m</sup> Hanna, St Margaret's, Ann Arundel.  
Thomas Gates, St Ann's, Annapolis.  
John Andrews, St Thomas's, Balt. County.  
Hamilton Bell, Stephney, Somerset County.  
Francis Walker, Kent Island.  
John Stewart, Porttobasco Parish, Charles County.

In this important document we find the first public assumption of the present legal title of the "Protestant Episcopal Church" by a representative body of the American Church.\*

\* The history of the adoption of the name "Protestant Episcopal," as applied to the American Church, is given by the late Dr. Ethan Allen, historiographer of the Diocese of Maryland, in his *Protestant Episcopal Conventions in Maryland of A. D. 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783*, appended to the Convention Journal of 1878. It is as follows:—

"The Convention convened at Chestertown, Kent county, Nov. 9th, 1780. There were present, Rev. Samuel Keene, Rector of St. Luke's, Queen Anne's county; Rev. William Smith, D. D., Rector of Chester Parish, Kent county; Rev. James Jones Wilmer, Rector of Shrewsbury Parish, Kent county; Col. Richard Lloyd, Vestryman of St. Paul's Parish, Kent county; Mr. James Dunn, Vestryman of St. Paul's Parish, Kent county; Mr. John Page, Vestryman of St. Paul's Parish, Kent county; Mr. Richard Miller, Vestryman of St. Paul's Parish, Kent county; Mr. Simon Wickes, Vestryman of St. Paul's Parish, Kent county; Dr. John Scott, Vestryman of Chester Parish, Kent county; Mr. John Bolton, Vestryman of Chester Parish, Kent county; Mr. J. W. Tilden, Vestryman of Chester Parish, Kent county; Mr. St. Leger Everett, Vestryman of Chester Parish, Kent County; Mr. James Wroth, Vestryman of Chester Parish, Kent county; Mr. John Kennard, Church Warden of Chester Parish, Kent county; Mr. Sturgess, Church Warden of Chester Parish, Kent county; Mr. Christopher Hall, Vestryman of Shrewsbury, S. Sassafras, Kent; Mr. George Moffett, Vestryman of Shrewsbury, S. Sassafras, Kent; Mr. William Keating, Vestryman of Shrewsbury, S. Sassafras, Kent; Mr. C——, Church Warden of Shrewsbury, S. Sassafras, Kent; Mr. John Brown, Vestryman of St. Luke's, Queen Anne's county; Mr. Downs, Vestryman of St. Luke's, Queen Anne's county; Dr. William Bordly; Dr. Van Dyke; Col. Isaac Perkins; Mr. Chas. Groom; Mr. William Keene; Mr. James Hackett.

"Dr. Smith was appointed President, and Mr. Wilmer, Secretary.

"A petition to the General Assembly of Maryland for the support of public religion was then read and approved, and ordered to be sent to each Vestry in the State; and if by them approved, after obtaining signatures in their respective parishes, it was to be carried up to the legislature. . . .

"On motion of the Secretary, it was proposed that the Church known in the province as Protestant be called 'the Protestant Episcopal Church,' and it was so adopted."

In a letter dated May 6, 1810, from the Rev. James Jones Wilmer to Bishop Claggett, he writes: "I am one of the three who first organised the Episcopal Church during the Revolution; and am consequently one of the primary aids of its consolidation throughout the United States. The Rev. Dr. Smith, Dr. Keene, and myself held the *first* convention at Chestertown, and I acted as secretary." He also states in this letter that "he moved that the Church of England as heretofore so known in the province be now called The Protestant Episcopal Church, and it was so adopted." — See *Maryland Archives*.

There is also the unequivocal assertion of "the ecclesiastical and spiritual independence of 'the Protestant Episcopal Church in Maryland,'" as necessarily included in the civil independence of the State. The undoubted and inherent right of this Church of Maryland "to preserve herself as an *entire* Church, agreeably to her ancient usages and profession," as well as to exercise her "spiritual power" derived "from CHRIST and His Apostles," independent of "every foreign or other jurisdiction," so far as "consistent with the civil rights of society," is claimed. The necessity of "Episcopal ordination and commission," to the "valid administration of the Sacraments and the due exercise of the Ministerial Functions in the said Church" is clearly laid down, and the exclusive right of "the Ministry by regular Episcopal ordination" to be "admitted into or enjoy any of the Churches, Chapels, Glebes, or other property formerly belonging to the Church of England," is emphatically asserted. It is claimed that "the said Church when duly organised, constituted, and represented in a Synod or Convention of her Ministry and people" is competent "to revise her Liturgy, Forms of Prayer, and public worship, in order to adapt the same to the late revolution, and other local circumstances of America." There is also an authoritative recognition of the right of the laity to admission to the councils of the Church, and this document, it will be borne in mind, was the production of the Clergy alone. In this, as in so many other instances of a similar nature, the influence of the positions laid down and the principles enunciated in *The Case of the Episcopal Churches Considered*, by William White, is clearly seen. Deprecating any "further departure from the venerable order and beautiful forms of worship of the Church" of England "than may be found expedient in the change of our situation from a daughter to a sister Church," these clergymen of Maryland, less than a score in number, acting under the inspiration and guidance of the Philadelphia rector, laid broad

The Rev. Mr. Wilmer subsequently adopted the views of Swedenborg. Dr. Smith, who, as president of this meeting, doubtless put the motion to vote and announced the result, was subsequently the choice of the Maryland Convention as their Bishop. Grave charges affecting his character, made at the Convention at Wilmington, Del., in 1786, when White and Provoost were recommended to England for consecration, were, mainly through the influence of Dr. White, successful in preventing his endorsement by the Convention, and he never attained the object of his ambition.

It should be borne in mind that these early conventions in Maryland were solely concerned with secular rights and privileges, and in no sense ecclesiastical in their character or purpose.

and deep in this comprehensive and yet conservative document the foundations of the Ecclesiastical Constitution of the American Church.

In the style and language of this "Declaration of Rights," it is not difficult to recognise as its author the distinguished clergyman whose name is first appended to it. "The proceedings of these conventions," says Bishop White, "with measures taken at other times and in other matters by the Clergy of this State were chiefly originated and conducted by the Rev. Dr. Smith, who, in his residence there, during the seizure of the charter-rights of the College of Philadelphia, exerted his excellent talents in these and in other public works." \*

On March 29, 1784, there met in the study of Dr. White's house, at the southwest corner of Pine and Front Streets, Philadelphia, — a site now occupied by S. Peter's House, — the clergy of the city, and representatives of the vestries of the united Churches of Christ Church and S. Peter's, and S. Paul's, with a view to the organisation of the Church in the State of Pennsylvania. The records † of this conference, and the meet-

\* *Memoir*, second edition, p. 92.

† The records of the first meetings in Pennsylvania, convened at the instance, and assembled under the superintendence, of Dr. White, having in view the organisation of the Church in Pennsylvania, are given in full from the original manuscript, in Dr. White's handwriting, in the archives of the General Convention. Another copy in the same handwriting is in the possession of the author.

PHILADELPHIA, *March 29, 1784,*

At ye House of ye revd Dr White,

Rector of Christ's Church & St Peters.

In consequence of Appointments made by ye Vestry of Christ's Church & St Peter's and by ye Vestry of St Paul's Church, viz., by ye Vestry of Christ's Church & St Peter's as followeth,

"The Rector mentioned to ye Vestry that he lately had a Conversation with ye revd Dr Magaw on ye Subject of appointing a Committee from ye Vestries of their respective Churches to confer with ye Clergy of ye said Churches, on ye Subject of forming a representative Body of ye episcopal Churches in this State, & wished to have ye Sense of this Vestry thereon. After some consideration ye Vestry agreed to appoint Matthew Clarkson & Wm Pollard for Christ's Church and Dr Clarkson & Mr John Chaloner for St Peters.

And by ye Vestry of St Paul's Church as followeth,

"A Copy of ye Minute of ye Vestry of ye United Churches of Christ's Church & St Peters of ye 13th of Novr last was, by ye revd Dr Magaw, laid before this Vestry & is as follows. (Here followeth ye Minute.) The above Minute being taken into consideration and this Vestry concurring in Opinion thereon, unanimously appointed Lambert Wilmer & Plunket Fleeson Esqres on ye part of this Church, to carry into Execution the good Intentions of ye aforesaid recited Minute.

The Clergy, together with ye Gentlemen named in ye said appointments (except Matthew Clarkson Esqre & Dr Clarkson, who were detained by Sickness) assembled at ye time & place above mentioned.

ings subsequent, together with those of the "primary" convention which followed May 24, 1784, were carefully preserved by

The Body thus assembled, after taking into consideration ye Necessity of speedily adopting Measures for ye forming a Plan of ecclesiastical Government for ye Episcopal Church, are of Opinion, that a Subject of such Importance ought to be taken up, if possible, with ye concurrence of ye Episcopalians generally in ye U. States. They therefore, resolve to ask a Conference with such Members of ye episcopal Congregations in ye Counties of this State as are now in town ; & they authorize ye Clergymen now present to converse with such Persons as they can find of ye above Description & to request their meeting this Body at Christ's Church on Wednesday Evening at seven O'Clock.

Adjourned to ye same Time & Place.

CHRIST'S CHURCH, March 31.

The Clergy & ye two Committees assembled according to adjournment, (all ye Members being present exceptg Mw Clarkson Esqre, detained by sickness) & ye Body thus assembled elected Dr White their Chairman.

The Clergy reported, that agreeably to ye appointment of ye last Meeting, they had spoken to several Gentlemen, who readily consented to ye proposed Conference.

The Meeting continued some Time ; when it was signified to them, that several Gentlemen who had designed to attend were detained by ye unexpected Sitting of ye honl House of Assembly, they being Members of that House. The honl James Read, Esqre attended according to Desire.

After some Conversation on ye Business of this Meeting, it was resolved, that a circular Letter be addressed to ye Ch : Wardens & Vestrymen of ye respective episcopal Congregations in ye State ; and that ye same be as followeth ; viz,

GENTLEMEN, — The Episcopal Clergy in this City, together with a Committee appointed by ye Vestry of Christ's Church & St Peters and another Committee appointed by ye Vestry of St Paul's Church in ye same for ye purpose of proposing a Plan of ecclesiastical Government, being now assembled, are of Opinion, that a Subject of such Importance ought to be taken up, if possible, with ye concurrence of ye Episcopalians generally in ye U. States. They have therefore resolved as preparatory to a general Consultation, to request ye Church wardens and Vestrymen of each episcopal Congregation in ye State to delegate one or more of their Body to assist at a Meeting to be held in this City on Monday ye 24th day of May next, and such Clergymen as have parochial Cure in ye said Congregations to attend ye Meeting ; which they hope will contain a full Representation of ye episcopal Church in this State.

The above Resolve, Gentlemen, the first Step in their Proceedings, they now respectfully and affectionately communicate to you.

Signed, in behalf of ye Body now assembled,

W. WHITE, Chairman.

Resolved : that a circular Letter be sent to some one Gentleman in each of the said Congregations ; and that Copies of ye same be left with ye Chairman, ye respective Directions to be supplied by him after due Enquiry ; & that ye Letter be as followeth ; viz,

SIR, — The Body herein mentioned, being informed that you are a Member of ye episcopal Church in \_\_\_\_\_ & always ready to attend to it's concerns, take ye Liberty of requesting you to deliver ye enclosed.

Signed in behalf of ye said Body,

W. WHITE, Chairman.

Resolved : that ye Letters addressed to ye Churches formerly included in ye Mission of Radnor be enclosed under Cover to ye revd W. Currie their former Pastor ;

Dr. White, at whose instance and under whose presidency these meetings were held.

At the meeting in Christ Church, in May, an interesting communication, which might be considered somewhat in the light of a letter of instructions addressed by the Rev. Dr. Smith

& the Clergy are desired to accompany them with a Letter to ye said revd Gentleman requesting his Assistance at ye proposed Meeting.

Resolved : that as ye revd Joseph Hutchins is ye Minister of ye Churches formerly included in ye Mission of Lancaster, ye circular Letter be addressed to him & not to ye Ch : wardens & Vestrymen of ye said Congregations.

Resolved : that it be recommended to ye Vestries under whose appointments these Proceedings are made, to cause ye same to be read to their respective Congregations on Easter Monday at their annual Election of Ch : wardens & Vestrymen.

The Chairman is empowered to call Meetings, at any time previous to Easter.

Adjourned.

At ye house of Dr White,

April 6th.

The Clergy & ye Committees met ; except Matthew Clarkson, Esqre, who was detained by Sicknes.

The Chairman reported, that he had forwarded Letters to every Church of which he could receive Information ; & that there are two small Congregations who were never provided with an Incumbent, of whom he hath not yet been able to ascertain, whether they be in Chester County or in ye State of Delaware ; he is desired to make further Enquiry & in case they shall be found to be in Chester County, to invite them to ye intended Meeting. The names of ye gentn to whom ye Letters have been addressed, are as follow : those for ye Late Mission of Radnor to ye revd Wm Currie ; those for ye late Mission of Lancaster to ye revd Joseph Hutchins ; that for Oxford to Mr Cotman ; that for All Saints, Pequestan, to Mr Johnston ; that for Whitemarsh to Mr Saml Wheeler ; that for Bristol to W. Cox, Esqre ; that for Reading to Collinson Read, Esqre ; that for Morlatton to Mr George Douglass ; that for Carlisle to Col Smith ; that for York to Col Hartley ; that for a Church near York to ye same Gentleman ; that for Chester to Edw Vernon, Esqre ; that for Marcus Hook to Mr Saml Armer : and that for Concord to Mr Isaak Bullock.

The foregoing is a true Acct of ye proceedings of ye episcopal Clergy & Committees from ye respective Vestries of ye episcopal Churches at three different Meetings.

Signed in behalf of ye said Body,

W. WHITE, Chairman.

P. S. It appearing that the Revd Mr Illing is ye Minister of ye epl : Ch : in Caernarvon & Piquea & that ye revd Mr Mitchell had gathered a Congregation at Fort Pitt, ye Clergy wrote to those Gentn inviting them to ye Meeting together with Delegates from their Vestries, the Committees of ye two Vestries being at this Time dissolved by ye Elections at Easter.

W. WHITE.

The original manuscript bears the following endorsement : —

I deposit this with ye Committee of ye General Convention for collecting Journals : it being ye original Record of ye first steps taken for ye organizing of ye episcopal Church throughout ye Union.

WM : WHITE.

Oct. 30, 1821.

[Endorsed] First Meeting of Conv<sup>n</sup> for Organizing ye Church.

to the deputies of the parish he had formerly served under appointment of the venerable society, was presented by the gentlemen to whom it had been sent : —

MESSRS. BENJ<sup>M</sup>. COTMAN and BENJ<sup>M</sup>. JOHNSON.

I know not what can be done at your meeting of vestries. This at least I wish, that a Clergyman or two, and about two Vestrymen, may be appointed a Committee to meet Committees from the neighbouring States, at some convenient place, about next October, to fix on a general plan for all our Churches, both in respect to Discipline and our Church Service. Something fundamental ought also to be agreed upon respecting Ordination, &c., similar to what was done in Maryland, a copy of which I gave to Dr. Magaw, declaring that Episcopal Ordination is an indispensable qualification for every person who may be desirous to hold any living in our Church. Certainly none else can hold any of the churches heretofore established or built under the Society for propagating the Gospel, nor the glebes where any are. There will be Committees from several of the Southern States, especially Maryland and Virginia, but they can hardly be got together till towards the end of September. I hope they may be induced to meet as far North as conveniently may be, perhaps at Philada, or Brunswick, or Wilmington in Delaware State.

WM. SMITH.

Dated from Chester, Maryland, May 23.

This letter, as appears from its endorsement, was read by Dr. White before the Committee, at their meeting in Christ Church, May 26, 1784.

This assembling in Christ Church of clergy and laity, in one body, for the accomplishment of measures looking to the reorganisation and perpetuation of the Church in Pennsylvania, became memorable in view of the fact, as Bishop White is at pains to inform us,\* “that this was the first ecclesiastical assembly in any of the States consisting partly of lay members.” He adds that he “was considered at the time to be the proposer of the measure, the principle of it having been advocated, about a year before, in a pamphlet known to be his.” In this convention there were present four of the Clergy, — the Rev. Drs. William White and Samuel Magaw, and the Rev. Messrs. Robert Blackwell and Joseph Hutchins, — and twenty-one of the laity, representing the United Churches, and S. Paul’s of Philadelphia, S. James’s, Bristol, Trinity, Oxford, All Saint’s, Pemakecka, S. Paul’s, Chester, S. David’s, Radnor, S. Peter’s, in the valley, S. Martin’s, Marcus

\* *Memoirs of the Church*, second edition, p. 86.

Hook, S. James's, Lancaster, S. James's, Perkioming, S. John's, New London, Huntington Church, York County, S. Mary's, Reading, and S. Gabriel's, Morlatton, Berks County. The principle was laid down at the start that each Church should have one vote. A "Standing Committee of the Episcopal Church in this State, consisting of clergy and laity," was appointed with a view to concerted action with "representatives of the Episcopal Church in the other States, or any of them," in "framing an ecclesiastical government." "Fundamental principles," or "instructions," for the government of this Committee were adopted, by which the Committee was to be "bound." These principles declared the independence of "the Episcopal Church in these States" of "all foreign authority, ecclesiastical, or civil;" asserted its "full and exclusive powers to regulate the concerns of its own communion;" professed its doctrinal agreement with the Church of England, and announced its purpose of preserving "uniformity of worship" "as near as may be to the Liturgy of the said Church;" recognised the three orders of the ministry, "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," with rights and powers respectively to be "ascertained" and "exercised according to reasonable laws" when "duly made;" declared that the right of enacting "canons or laws" was only in "a representative body of the clergy and laity conjointly," and stipulated "that no powers be delegated to a general ecclesiastical government, except such as cannot conveniently be exercised by the clergy and vestries in their respective congregations." \*

The Standing Committee thus constituted consisted of the four clergymen in attendance, together with eight of the laity. The latter delegated their powers to such of their number, together with Samuel Powel and Richard Peters, Esquires, as might attend the general meeting called to assemble in New York during the following autumn.

The meeting in New Brunswick suggested by the Rev. Abraham Beach assembled on May 11, a few days prior to the meeting of the Pennsylvania Convention in Christ Church, to which we have referred. Bishop White, in his *Memoirs*,† dates this preliminary gathering a little later in the month; but the origi-

\* *Journal of the Meetings which led to the Institution of a Convention, etc.*, Philadelphia, 1786. Vide, also, Perry's *Historical Notes and Documents*, pp. 37-39.

† The Bishop, in his *Memoirs*, second edition, p. 21, inadvertently gives the date of this meeting "the 13th and 14th of May."

nal record, still preserved, in the handwriting of Benjamin Moore, subsequently the second Bishop of New York, is conclusive on this point. The minutes of this preliminary convention are informal and brief, filling less than a quarto letter-sheet; and their preservation is due to the care with which Bishop White gathered and preserved the data of our history.\*

This meeting convened as "a voluntary meeting of sundry members of the Corporation for the Relief of Widows," etc., and after the business of this important charity had been considered, it resolved itself into an assembly of "several members of the Episcopal Church, both of the clergy and laity, from the States of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania." A committee of correspondence was appointed "for the purpose of forming a continental representation of the Episcopal Church and for the better management of the concerns of the said Church." There were present at this conference the Rev. Drs. White and Magaw, the Rev. Messrs. Beach, Bloomer, Frazer, Ogden, Blackwell, Bowden, Benjamin Moore, and Thomas Moore, and Messrs. James Parker, John Stevens, Richard Stevens, John Dennis, Esquire, and Colonels Hoyt and Furman. A committee was designated, consisting of the Rev. Messrs. Abraham Beach, Joshua Bloomer, and Benjamin Moore, to attend the Trinity Convocation of the Connecticut clergy, "for the purpose of soliciting their concurrence . . . in such measures

\* At New Brunswick, Tuesday, 11th May, 1784, several Members of the Episcopal Church, both of the Clergy & Laity, from the States of New York, New Jersey, & Pennsylvania were assembled together. Present: The Revd. Dr. White, Revd. Dr. Magaw, Revd. Mr. Beach, Revd. Mr. Bloomer, Revd. Mr. Fraser, Revd. Mr. Ogden, Revd. Mr. Blackwell, Revd. Mr. Boden, Revd. Mr. Benjn. Moore, Revd. Mr. Thos. Moore, James Parker, John Stevens, Richard Stevens, John Dennis, Esquires, Col. Hoyt & Col. Furman.

It was agreed, that the Revd. Messrs. Beach, Bloomer & B. Moore be requested to wait upon the Clergy of Connecticut, who are to be convened on the Wednesday in Trinity Week next ensuing, for the Purpose of soliciting their Concurrence with us in such Measures as may be deemed conducive to the Union & Prosperity of the Episcopal Churches in the States of America.

Also agreed by the Gentlemen present, that the undermentioned Persons be requested to correspond with each other, & with any other Persons, for the Purpose of forming a Continental Representation of the Episcopal Church, & for the better Management of other Concerns of the said Church.

Revd. Messrs. Bloomer, Provoost & B. Moore for New York.

Revd. Messrs. Beach, Ogden & Ayres for New Jersey.

Revd. Dr. White, Dr. Magaw, & Mr. Blackwell for Pennsylvania.

Any one of which Persons of each State respectively, to correspond with the others, without consulting his Colleagues of the same State, whenever it may be deemed expedient. — *From the Bishop White Papers.*

as may be deemed conducive to the Union and prosperity of the Episcopal Church in the States of America." It would appear that other committees of a similar nature were appointed to interest the clergy and laity of the States at the southward in the proposed meeting in New York. A letter from the Rev. Mr. Beach, addressed to Dr. White, throws additional light on this interesting portion of our history :—

NEW BRUNSWICK, 19<sup>th</sup> June, 1784.

DEAR SIR, — I have just returned from New England in company with Mr. Bloomer and Mr. Moore ; and at their desire am now to acquaint you, that the Clergy there appear well disposed to join the Episcopal Church in the other States, in forming Regulations for the government of it, and for preserving uniformity of worship.

They, indeed, made some Objection with respect to Lay Delegates. We informed them, in answer to their Objections, that it was thought necessary in some of the States, particularly in Pennsylvania, to associate some respectable Characters amongst the Laity, in order to give weight and importance to the Church ; but we meant not to prescribe to other States, — provided the end was obtained, we would not differ with them as to the means, if they were only fair and honest. They replied that they thought themselves fully equal to the Business of representing the Episcopal Church in their State, and that the Laity did not expect or wish to be called in as delegates on such an occasion ; but would, with full confidence, trust matters purely ecclesiastical to their Clergy. They accordingly determined unanimously to send a Com<sup>tee</sup> of their Body to represent the Episcopal Church of Connecticut at our intended Meeting in N. York on the Tuesday after Michaelmas ; and to get a representation from the States further Eastward.

Thus you find the Com<sup>tee</sup> appointed to attend the Convention in Connecticut have executed the Purposes of their appointment ; and expect the Com<sup>tee</sup> of Correspondence in Philadelphia will endeavour to procure a representation from the more Southern States.\*

A kindly letter, addressed to the Rev. Samuel Parker, of Trinity Church, Boston, Mass., of which, unfortunately, but a fragment remains,† gives us Dr. White's own views of the movement for organisation he had so deeply at heart :—

REVD. SIR : — I am informed by your Townsman, y<sup>e</sup> rev<sup>d</sup> Mr. Clarke, that you wish to be informed of y<sup>e</sup> Measures in contemplation with y<sup>e</sup>

\* From the Bishop White Correspondence.

† From the Bishop Parker MSS. in the possession of the author.

ep<sup>l</sup> Clergy in these parts for y<sup>e</sup> continuance of our Church and that you did me y<sup>e</sup> honor to name me as one of whom you wished him to make y<sup>e</sup> Inquiry. I embrace y<sup>e</sup> Opportunity of opening my Mind to you in some sentiments additional to those general Principles which y<sup>e</sup> Clergy in this City forwarded to you by y<sup>e</sup> hon<sup>l</sup> Mr. Lowell. From these last you will learn y<sup>e</sup> outlines of our System : and it only remains to mention in what way we wish to see a representative Body of y<sup>e</sup> Church constituted in each State and a general Representative Body for y<sup>e</sup> Continent.

I therefore, Sir, propose for your consideration, whether it will not be expedient to have in each State a certain Body composed of all y<sup>e</sup> Clergy and Lay-Delegates from y<sup>e</sup> Congregations (perhaps) according to y<sup>e</sup> respective Numbers — Whether it will not be proper to provide that where y<sup>e</sup> Church is numerous in any State or may hereafter become so in others, such States should be divided into Districts and y<sup>e</sup> State representative Body formed by Delegation therefrom — Whether y<sup>e</sup> Church of a State though not numerous enough to have a Bishop may not be perfectly organised, except a Dependence required on some other for y<sup>e</sup> single purpose of Ordination, a President in such case to be chosen annually ; and Whether, if a State be divided into Districts there may not be a Bishop in each District, whereby each B<sup>p</sup> having a very moderate superintendence, might be also a Parish Minister, and would not require a separate Revenue for his support, y<sup>e</sup> getting such a Revenue being perhaps impracticable ?

In respect to a continental Representative, — or a Convocation of y<sup>e</sup> Ep. Ch. in y<sup>e</sup> U. S., I submit to you, whether (were they even to meet but once in three, four, or five years) such a Body be not essential to our keeping together one Church as y<sup>e</sup> R. Catholics, Presbyterians and Quakers do respectively, — and whether such a Body might not be formed, without any great Burthen, by a Delegation from each State ?

I know, rev<sup>d</sup> Sir, that y<sup>e</sup> introducing the Laity into our Scheme is thought exceptionable by some of our Brethren. In answer, I will not pretend any apprehensions of y<sup>e</sup> Clergy acquiring extravagant Powers ; altho' could I foresee such an event, it would confirm me in my principle. But under present Circumstances, I rather expect, that without y<sup>e</sup> Laity, there will be no Gov<sup>t</sup> at all ; \* and that there will be no per-

\* In the autumn of 1862, the writer, on reading to the Rev. Dr. Hawks the above letter, which had been but lately discovered among the manuscript treasures belonging to a daughter of Bishop Parker, the late Mrs. Dr. Theodore Edson, of Lowell, Mass., called attention to the expression of Dr. White as here recorded, where-upon Dr. Hawks, after strongly confirming the statement made in the text, wrote on the margin of the letter the following note : —

“ Bishop White repeatedly told the writer of this note, that such was the feeling on the subject of introducing the laity, that had they been excluded, no union or constitution would ever have been formed.

F. L. HAWKS.”

sons capable of exercising that Authority which y<sup>e</sup> XXth and XXIVth Articles of y<sup>e</sup> Church of England consider essentially inherent to every Church ; In short, whatever y<sup>e</sup> Clergy alone shall do will be treated as what a Cong<sup>n</sup> may either receive or reject and as not even binding on y<sup>e</sup> dissenting Members of their own Body ; and y<sup>e</sup> Consequence will at last be, that y<sup>e</sup> several Congregations being independent of one another, will gradually widen in Doctrine, and Worship, agreeing perhaps in y<sup>e</sup> single circumstance of their requiring episcopal Ordination.

On y<sup>e</sup> Subject of procuring y<sup>e</sup> succession I shall only observe, that if any private Measures said to have been undertaken for this End sh<sup>d</sup> prove successful, I think y<sup>e</sup> whole Church sh<sup>d</sup> gladly avail itself of y<sup>e</sup> Acquisition. If not, an Application to our Mother Church from Representatives of y<sup>e</sup> ep<sup>l</sup> Church generally will be surely too respectable to be slighted ; and such an Application might be easily framed by correspondence among ourselves.

Should you, rev<sup>d</sup> Sir, think any Part of our Plan exceptionable or have any thing in Addition to offer, I shall be as friendly in attending to your Sentiments as I am free in offering my own.

I have y<sup>e</sup> pleasure to inform you, that last Tuesday there must have been a Meeting of y<sup>e</sup> Clergy of Mary<sup>ld</sup> & Delegates from y<sup>e</sup> Vestries ; but their Proceedings are not known here.

By a Letter from y<sup>e</sup> rev<sup>d</sup> Mr. Beach of Brunswick, I am informed that at a late Meeting of y<sup>e</sup> Clergy of Connecticut, they appointed a Committee of their Body to meet us in N. York, on y<sup>e</sup> 1st Tuesday after Michaelmas and have . . . .

The reply to this letter affords information of interest and value : \*—

REVEREND SIR : I had the Honour of receiving your favour of the 30<sup>th</sup> ult<sup>o</sup>. enclosing several Copies of the minutes of a Meeting of the Episcopal Churches at Philadelphia, by the Hon<sup>ble</sup> M<sup>r</sup> Lowell last week.

You judged very right that the Opportunity then presented would convey the annexed Information sooner than the Plan agreed on between you and the Gentlemen of New York and New Jersey, as no Intelligence from any of them has yet reached me. I have communicated a copy of the minutes to each of the Episcopal clergy in this Commonwealth.

We are indeed but five in Number, for when the British Troops evacuated this Town in March 1776, all the Episcopal Clergy in this Town myself excepted and many from the other Towns accompanied them and have never since returned. Indeed, but two others remained in the whole Government, these were the Rev<sup>d</sup> M<sup>r</sup> Bass of

\* From the Bishop White MSS.

Newburyport who was a Missionary from the Society, but now for reasons unknown dismissed their Service, and Rev<sup>d</sup> Mr Wheeler, who was an Assistant to the Rector of Trinity Church in Newport, Rhode Island ; the latter being a native of this Province, upon the breaking out of the War retired to a small patrimony in the Vicinity of this Town and did not officiate at all till within a Twelvemonth past he was invited to the churches in Scituate and Marshfield in the County of Plymouth. Since the War two Clergymen have settled in this State : Rev<sup>d</sup> Mr Lewis, who was Chaplain in Burgoyne's Regiment of light Dragoons, left that Service and came to this Town in 1778 and settled at Christ's Church ;

The other, the Rev<sup>d</sup> Mr Fisher, who came from Annapolis in Nova Scotia in 1780 and settled in Salem. The oldest Church in this Town, formerly known by the Name of King's Chapel, is now supplied by a Lay Reader who is a Candidate for holy Orders.\* There are five or six other Churches in some of which lay readers now officiate. In the State of New Hampshire, there are but two Episcopal Churches, one at Portsmouth the metropolis of the Government, where there has been no clergyman since the War, the other in a new Settlement in the western part of the State † where a Missionary from the Society in England is now resident. In the State of Rhode Island are three Churches only, exclusive of one at Bristol which was burnt by the British. In neither of these is there a Clergyman in holy Orders, but in two of them there are Lay Readers who are candidates. Mr. Graves, Missionary from the Society, still resides at Providence, but has not officiated since the commencement of the War. The State of Connecticut contains the greatest Number of Episcopal Churches of any of the New England States. There are now fourteen missionaries from the Society besides seven other Clergymen not in their service. This, Sir, is a brief State of the Episcopal Church in the four Northern Governments which are contained in what is called New England. I flatter myself this account will not be disagreeable nor perhaps useless to you in your future Consultations respecting the Episcopal Church in America.

Permit me now, Sir, to make several Enquiries respecting the Plan proposed at your Meeting. Was it the intention of the Churches that met at Philadelphia to devise a Plan for the future Government of the Episcopal Churches in all the States or for Pennsylvania only ? How far did your Convention mean to carry their first Instruction or fundamental Principle respecting the independence of the Episcopal Church in these States of all foreign ecclesiastical authority ? Is it

\* James Freeman, refused Ordination on account of Arianism. *Vide Greenwood's History of King's Chapel.*

† Claremont.

meant to carry the Independence so far as to exclude the obtaining a Bishop from England? If so I plainly foresee great Objections will arise in the Northern States and especially in those Churches which have been and still are under the Patronage of the Society at home. What Plan is proposed for the procuring an Episcopate and from what Source can a sufficient support be derived?

I shall esteem it a peculiar favour, Sir, if it is not impos<sup>s</sup> too great a task, to have your Sentiments upon these Points, and that you will also oblige me with an Account of the Alterations in and Additions to the Liturgy already in use in your State. As no Alteration except that of omitting the Prayers for the King and Royal Family has taken place in the Churches in general in these States, I am desirous of knowing how the Churches at the Southward manage in this affair, that if possible a Uniformity as far as the civil government of each State will permit may be maintained.

I esteem myself very happy in having this occasion of opening a Correspondence, to the continuance of which nothing shall be wanting in my power.

Be kind enough to present my kind Regards to your Brethren in the Ministry, and be assured I shall take Pleasure in exerting my little Influence and Endeavour to promote a Uniformity of Government and Worship, and preserving the Communion of the Episcopal Churches in the United States.

I have the Honour to be, Rev<sup>d</sup> Sir, with great esteem,  
Your brother, and very Humble Servant,

SAMUEL PARKER.

BOSTON, *June 21, 1784.*

The Rev. WILLIAM WHITE, D. D.

Dr. White's reply was as follows : —

REVD. SIR: My delay in answering your kind Letter of y<sup>e</sup> 21<sup>st</sup> of June has been owing to my Desire of sending to you some Acc<sup>t</sup> of the Proceedings of y<sup>e</sup> Clergy and Lay-Delegates in Maryl<sup>d</sup>. But being disappointed in my Expectation of receiving it, owing as I suppose to the Delay in printing it, as it contains both a Sermon and a projected Constitution, I can no longer postpone acknowledging your favour and giving an Answer to your Enquiries.

The fundamental Principles which you have seen were merely meant as Instructions to a Committee in their Consultations with our Brethren in y<sup>e</sup> other States for y<sup>e</sup> forming a general Constitution for y<sup>e</sup> Continent, which we think sh<sup>d</sup> be attempted before we venture to form a Constitution for this State in particular. The Independence asserted is intended in y<sup>e</sup> most unlimited Sense; but we do not think this precludes us from procuring a Bishop from England, he becoming on his Arrival a Citizen of y<sup>e</sup> U. S. Proper Measures for procuring an

Episcopate we wish to see taken at y<sup>e</sup> ensuing Meeting in N. York : but, as to his support, I know no source for it but a parochial Living. The only Addition we have made to y<sup>e</sup> Prayers is to alter that for y<sup>e</sup> Parliam<sup>t</sup> so as to suit for y<sup>e</sup> Delegates of these States in Congress and all others vested with civil Authority ; we are sensible of the Imperfection of our Plan and that y<sup>e</sup> Litany and other Prayers ought to be accommodated to y<sup>e</sup> political Change ; but, lest Uniformity should be precluded, we chose to leave this to a general Communication of Sentiment.

I thank you, Sir, for y<sup>e</sup> Information contained in your Letter. Our Numbers are as follows. Those of us who were settled in this State before y<sup>e</sup> War are M<sup>r</sup> Currie, of Chester County, whose Age and Infirmities prevent his officiating, M<sup>r</sup> Elling of Caernavon, and myself. During y<sup>e</sup> War, y<sup>e</sup> rev<sup>d</sup> D<sup>r</sup> Magaw (formerly Missionary in Delaware), settled as Rector of St Paul's in this City, and M<sup>r</sup> Blackwell (formerly Missionary in Jersey) settled as Ass<sup>t</sup> to me in y<sup>e</sup> United Churches. Since y<sup>e</sup> Peace we have y<sup>e</sup> accession of M<sup>r</sup> Hutchins at Lancaster and M<sup>r</sup> Campbell at Yorktown ; y<sup>e</sup> former a Native and late Resident of Barbadoes but educated in this City and y<sup>e</sup> latter a Native of this State who went for Orders in 1772, where he has resided until his late Return.

Once more, rev<sup>d</sup> Sir, I take y<sup>e</sup> Liberty of expressing my Hopes of seeing you at N. York on y<sup>e</sup> 5th of Oct<sup>r</sup> and am

Your Brother and humble Servt.,

W. WHITE.\*

PHILADA. Aug. 10, 1784.

Rev<sup>d</sup>. M<sup>r</sup>. PARKER.

P. S. Our Brethren in y<sup>e</sup> Ministry here desire their kind remembrances.

While this interesting correspondence was going on between two of the leading spirits in the churches of the North and the Middle States respectively, letters had been received from prominent clergymen in Maryland and Virginia, which, in the absence of those earlier addressed to the writers by Dr. White, indicate the nature of his communications, and illustrate his views : —

BALTIMORE, July 5, 1784.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR, — I am glad that I have an Opportunity of returning you my hearty Thanks for your letter, and the Proceedings of your Committee respecting Church Matters. I think with you that a Communication of Sentiments among its Clergy is necessary in the present circumstances of our Common Church ; and that

\* From the Bishop Parker MSS., in the possession of the author.

their most vigorous Exertions, and harmonizing Affections are equally so. . . .

I think that the Protestant Episcopal Church, in each particular State, is fully entitled to all the Rights and Authority that are essentially necessary to form and compleat an Entire Church ; and that, as the several States in Confederation have essential Rights and Powers independent on each other, so the Church in each State has essential Rights and Powers independent on those in other States. But still, as each State harmonises with its Sister-States, for the Common Good of the Confederation ; so, in like manner, each Particular Ch<sup>h</sup> should harmonise with its Sister Churches in the different States, for the Common Good of its Communion or Society at large.

If I am right in this, then it seems to me that the Particular Ch<sup>h</sup> in each State has an inherent and fundamental Right to exercise the Authority you allude to ; tho' it might happen that the *actual* Exercise of each independent Authority might not be consistent with some more 'General Plan.'

Yet notwithstanding, I do not think it impracticable to answer every *good* Purpose of any general Plan, and reserve at the same time, to each particular State-Church, all the Rights and Authority I have mentioned. For this end it appears to me that no more is necessary than such a Convocation as you mention (or something adequate to it) for the Purpose of Establishing throughout the Confederated States, an Uniformity of Worship and of Church Government.

When this foundation is once happily laid, the unimportant local variations of the several State Ch<sup>hs</sup> from each other, according to their particular Circumstances, cannot in my apprehension, either break its Communion or injure the Prosperity of the Church in general.

And in order to form such a Convocation, or adopt such Measures as would effectually answer the end, I conceive it not only prudent but even necessary that Lay-Members be delegated by the People for the Purpose, and that they concur with the Clergy.

As to the usage of the Primitive Ch<sup>h</sup> with respect to the Election of Bishops, I need not mention to you that it is difficult to speak positively. The Approbation of the Laity, tho' desirable, was not I believe necessary. And even tho' the Clergy might nominate, and be unhappy in an injudicious Nomination ; yet still the Approbation or Disapprobation of the Laity would have its due Effects, as the Encouragement and Support of a Bishop would rest almost entirely with them.

But happily for us, these Matters need occasion no Controversy. An injudicious Election may be laid aside, and a more judicious one made. Or if no Characters can be found, as yet, in these States, fit

for the Purpose, an Invitation may be given to some Pious, Exemplary, and Able Bishop or Bishops, to come and help us in the present Exigencies of our dismembered Church. Under the Presidency and Influence of such a Character, I doubt not every true member of the Ch<sup>h</sup>, whether Lay or Clerical, would be heartily desirous of adhering as closely to the Liturgy and Rules of the Church of England, as is consistent with the Principles of the late Revolution; and that the Laity would be as ready to approve of the Liturgy and Canons thus adapted to the Civil Governmt. of these States, as the Clergy would be unwilling to depart from the fundamental Principles of Episcopacy, and further than necessary from the beautiful Form, and approved Standard before them.

As to the Division of these States into some few Districts, and placing a Bishop in each of them, I confess I cannot see the least necessity for it. The limits of each State appears to me the most proper, as well as the most natural District for each Bishop. In this case each Ch<sup>h</sup> will be entire and independent, as the State in which it is; and will naturally form the proper Diocese of its Bishop. And supposing the States multiplied even into 23, I cannot think 23 Bishops too many for America. If they prove worthy of the high and sacred character, the more of them the better. And if some few should unhappily disgrace the Dignity of the Office, a respectable Number of the Order, being pious and venerable, will give weight and Sanction to Spiritual (which will probably be their *only*) Reproofs; and preserve it from Contempt.

These, Sir, are my present Sentiments on the Subject, and I shall be heartily thankful if you will endeavour to put me right where you think I am wrong.

The Proceedings of the late Convention at Annapolis are ordered to be published. At which Time I will endeavour to transmit you a Copy of them. In the interim, I cannot but inform you that a Committee is appointed for like Purposes with your Committee. But that the Letter you mention as addressed, or to be addressed to them, has not yet been received.

I am,

Reverend and dear Sir, your affectionate Servant,

WM. WEST.\*

Rev<sup>d</sup> Doctor WHITE.

Dr. West was one of the wisest and most devout of the Maryland clergy. His thoughtful letter, so clear in its enunciation of the views of State independency even in ecclesiastical matters, fittingly prefaces the letter we append from the Rev. David

\* From the Bishop White MSS.

Griffith, the first choice, a little later, of the Church in Virginia for the Episcopate, but unfortunately hindered by the indifference and neglect of those who elected him from attaining this office and administration in the Church of God.

FAIRFAX GLEBE, 26th July, 1784.

DEAR SIR, — Your different letters, to the Convention at Richmond and to myself, on the subject of a general meeting of the Episcopal Clergy at New York, were all received, but not time enough to be laid before Convention, which sat only three days. The Episcopal Church in Virginia is so fettered by Laws, that the Clergy could do no more than petition for a repeal of those laws — for liberty to introduce Ordination and Government and to revise and alter the Liturgy. The session is passed over without our being able to accomplish this. The few Clergymen at Richmond to whom your Letter was shewn, approved of the Plan and proceedings of the Pennsylvania Convention, and also of the general meeting at New York, but no delegates have been appointed to attend. In the Present State of Ecclesiastical affairs in this State, the Clergy could not, with propriety, and indeed without great danger to the Church, empower any Persons to agree to the least alteration whatever. I shall be able to explain to you the necessity of their acting with this caution when I shall have the pleasure of seeing you. Having some business in New York with the Executors of my Mother in Law, I shall endeavour to be there about the time of the general Convention; perhaps a few days before it: I shall, therefore, say no more on the subject of the Circular Letter, only that no notice of the intended meeting has been sent to North Carolina; none of the Clergy present, at the time of receiving your letter, having any acquaintance with the Brethren in that State.

Altho' this letter is addressed to you, yet I beg it may be considered as an answer to those signed by yourself together with our Brothers Magaw and Blackwell: — To whom (tho' I have not the pleasure of being Personally known to the former) I beg to be affectionately remembered.

I am, Dr. Sir,

Your affct. hmble. servt.,

DAVID GRIFFITH.\*

Rev. Dr. WHITE.

Added to this planning and shaping of the general organisation of our Church, there were letters written with evident pains and care, letters still remaining among our Church's archives; and from their faded, yellow foolscap pages and well-formed characters, abounding in the quaint contractions which attested the hurry and drive of a wearisome correspondence, they still

\* From the Bishop White MSS.

speak to us of the love and interest felt by William White in the successful working out of his plans for the Church of CHRIST. These letters, borne by post or packet, as we have seen, to Parker, in Boston, and through him to Bass, at Newburyport, and even as far as the destitute parish at Falmouth, just reviving from the ashes of the bombardment, and, as yet, unable to secure or support a clergyman; finding their way to New York, where the patriot Whigs were busied in measures for the election of Provoost to the rectorship of Trinity and to the episcopate of that State, if Bishops must be had at all; carried by water to the excellent Wharton, at Wilmington, in Delaware, where the first convert from Romanism to the true Catholic faith as held in our American Church was beginning a lifelong work of faithful labors in his new ecclesiastical home; borne on the great mail roads to the thoughtful William West, in Baltimore, one of the most earnest-minded and best of men; taken by coach to Chestertown, in Maryland, where the learned and accomplished William Smith, driven from one college, had almost immediately founded another and secured for it reputation and success; borne over winding ways and watercourses, to Fairfax, in Virginia, where the pious Griffith was laboring in his country parish, unconscious of the trials that awaited him in his fruitless struggle for the episcopate; and reaching at length South Carolina, where Henry Purcell, of Charleston, an interested correspondent, read them with avidity, wondering all the while as to his chances for a mitre,—these letters, in a day when note-paper and penny posts were never dreamed of by the most sanguine of correspondents, were the incentives to flagging exertions, and the incitements to success in quarters where any other writer would have had no such influence. Borne across the water in the heavy mail-bags of slowly-sailing packet ships, they conveyed to old friends and new ones abroad assurances of the revival of Church life in our Western hemisphere, where many anxious hearts had feared that life had been forever crushed out. Surely, then, as there are scattered around us while we write volume after volume of these carefully considered letters, clear and vigorous in their language, and fair in their swift chirography, we cannot withhold from William White—the patient, laborious, loving father of our revived, reorganised Church—our highest meed of praise, with an ever-deepening respect, an ever-increasing honor.

WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY.

## THE FIRST BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

### CHAP. IV. — THE FIRST COLONIAL EPISCOPATE.

IN removing to England Dr. Inglis did not lose interest in the affairs of the American Church, and we find in the letter we give below ample evidence both of his zeal in behalf of his former friends and brethren, and of the high estimation in which, in view of his abilities and his sufferings for the crown, he was held by the dignities of the mother-Church.

LONDON, MORTIMER ST., NO. 15. *June 6, 1786.*

REVEREND SIR : — Your letter of May 2, 1785, has lain by me some time ; and the reason of my not answering it was that I really had nothing of consequence to communicate. Some matters of moment relative to the Church in the American States have lately been brought forward, which call for the attention of all its real friends ; and as no person more ardently wishes that it may flourish in every part of America than I do, I flatter myself that it will not be disagreeable to you if I give you my sentiments on the subject. Be assured they flow from the sincerest good will to the Episcopal Church in your States, as well as for personal respect to yourself.

Before this time you have probably received the answer of the English Bishops to the conventional letter addressed to them, desiring to know whether they would consecrate persons sent here for that purpose. I need not therefore say much about it : it was friendly, and showed a disposition to grant your request ; but it was cautious as it was reported that you were about to make great alterations not only in the Liturgy, but in the creeds and articles. Since that time, the Bishops have received the whole of your common Prayer book, as altered by the Convention and observing with pleasure that the great essential doctrines of Christianity are preserved ; particularly, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and our Saviour's Attonement, which in this country are violently attacked at present by Socinians and Materialists. They have taken up the Business with greater zeal, and mean to comply fully with your request, if you yourselves will put it into their power. His Grace of Canterbury is particularly solicitous and active

in promoting the measure. He will apply for an act of Parliament this session to empower him and the other Bishops to consecrate the persons you may send over. By this packet he will write another letter to the Convention (directed under cover to you) and stating those conditions on which he and the other Bishops will comply ; and those conditions relate solely to yourselves, to the interest and welfare of the Church in America ; for the Bishops are no further concerned in them, than as they will thereby be enabled to comply with your request in a manner that is consistent with the Dictates of their conscience.

The conditions are such as, I hope you and the other American Clergy will think reasonable and advantageous ; and I hope are practicable. They are principally these that follow. 1. A Restoration of the article which has been expunged out of the Apostle's Creed. 2. A Restoration of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, so far at least as to leave the use of them discretionary. 3. Securing to the future Bishops that just and permanent authority, which is not only necessary for the Right Discharge of their Duty, and benefit of the Church, but which is warranted by Holy Scripture and practice of the Christian Church in every period of its existence, and 4, Proper Testimonials, such as the peculiarity of the case demands, of the competency in point of learning, the unblemished moral character and soundness in the Faith of those who may be sent over for consecration.

No man who has any regard to virtue or the purity of Religion will object to the last condition. With respect to the creeds I hope a compliance with the requisition will not, on mature reflexion, meet with opposition. I am a stranger to the reasons which induced the Convention to expunge the Descent into Hell ; but I may venture to affirm they were not solid ; and I say this after being well acquainted with the History of the article, and the fanciful explications that have been given of it by different persons. The Convention probably thought it a Tautology, but it really is not. It relates to a different thing from our Saviour's *death* and *burial*, these articles declare that our Saviour's soul was separated from his Body, which was *Death*, the Body was then laid in a grave, *i. e.*, was *Buried*, but the soul descended, or went into *Ades*, *i. e.*, the place of departed souls, so that this article holds out a different object of our belief from the two preceding articles. Accordingly it is received at this day by every Protestant Church in Christendom, I might say by every Christian Church upon earth. As to the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds they unquestionably contain the great Spiritual Doctrines of our Common Faith, as it has been ever professed by the Catholic Church of CHRIST. If there have been gainsayers of those doctrines in different ages, that should not stagger our Faith any more than the assertion of Deists or Atheists should

shake our belief in Revelation. And if it be considered to what lengths the spirit of innovation in Religion may carry men, how many there are at this day, who are zealous to overturn the Fundamentals of Christianity, and what encouragement they will receive by expunging those creeds. I trust those among you who have the honour and interest of Christianity at heart, and are zealous to preserve pure and incorrupt the *Faith which was once delivered to the Saints*, will be induced to reconsider this matter and restore those creeds, so far at least as the Bishops require. Were they fully replaced as before, it would be much better.

With regard to your future Bishop's permanent authority, I consider it as absolutely necessary to the peace and order and good Government of Churches. When I first saw the regulation made on this Head, I was astonished how any people professing themselves members of an Episcopal Church could think of degrading their Bishop in such a manner. No Episcopal Power whatever is reserved for him but that of ordination and perhaps confirmation. He is only a *member ex officio* of the Convention where he resides, but is not to take the chair or preside, unless he is asked; whereas such *Presidency* is as essential to his character as *ordination*. S. Paul's Bishop was to receive and judge of accusations brought against Presbyters, as hath been the case of Bishops ever since; but your Bishop has nothing to do with such matters. The Convention, consisting mostly of Clergymen, are to receive and judge of accusations against him. In short, his barber may shave him in the morning, and in the afternoon vote him out of office. I was astonished, I say, at this regulation, and could not account for the Clergy's agreeing to it; but my astonishment ceased, when I was assured by a letter from America, that all the Clergy except *one* opposed it, but were out-voted or overawed into a compliance by the Laity. This accounted for the matter; it is only one of the evils, which I foresaw would attend the introduction of so many Laymen into the Conventions, and be assured it will be followed by many others. However, I am sensible of your situation, and that you cannot do as you would. Now, viewing the matter in this light, I consider the interposition of the Bishops here on this head as a great advantage, the Church and Clergy with you; for it gives the Clergy ground to stand on which they had not before. They may now with propriety, and I trust with effect, plead for that authority for their future Bishops which is essential to their character, and necessary for the good Government of your Churches.

The authority of Bishop as such, is purely spiritual; it has nothing to do with Civil Constitutions, or their different forms. It existed as fully when Christianity was persecuted by heathen emperors, as when emperors became nursing Fathers of the Church—it exists as fully

now in the Roman Cantons or Republics of Switzerland, as it does in the Kingdom of France. It is therefore idle to say, that because the American States are republics, therefore Bishops residing in them must be stripped of the spiritual or ecclesiastical powers; for the one is no reason for the other, nor does the consequence by any means follow. The purely spiritual or ecclesiastical authority of a Bishop, and you should aim at no more, may be as well allowed and exercised in a democratic state, as in an absolute monarchy. It is a pity that some of you did not think of Bishop Usher's scheme of Episcopacy, which I would recommend to your Convention. Agreeably to the times in which he wrote it, he lopped off all external appendages, but still preserved the Episcopate of Episcopacy. The Bishops here have no right to interpose authoritatively — they can only admonish and advise; but when they do this in matters which are for your benefit, and which are necessary to enable them to serve you, consistently with their duty and convenience; then their advice should have great weight. You will find a benevolent, brotherly Christian spirit breathes throughout their letter, joined to a proper regard for the interests of religion. I sincerely wish their letter may have the desired effect, as it will tend much to the benefit of the Church; and I flatter myself that no endeavour of yours will be wanting for this purpose. It gives me great pleasure to find that your Church Seminary is likely to flourish under Mr. Andrews, of whom I always heard a good character. The Presbyterians have behaved with respect to your college just as I expected. They have uniformly behaved so whenever they gained an ascendancy, and had power in their hands.

I beg you will present my best compliments to Mrs. White. If Mrs. Vining or any of her family be in Philadelphia, remember me affectionately to them. With sincere, best wishes for your health and happiness I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your affectionate friend and brother,

CHARLES INGLIS.

Rev. Dr. WHITE.

P. S. This letter is secret and confidential. The communications it contains are for your own private use. The Archbishop's Letter has not been seen, nor will be by any person but myself, except the Bishops who join in it. I thought it would be of service to you to have this intelligence, and it is for this reason I write.

C. I.

The year 1787 was memorable in ecclesiastical annals as the epoch in which the Church of England gave to the American Church the episcopate so long withheld, and consecrated the

first Bishop for the Colonies. The choice had primarily fallen on the excellent Thomas Bradbury Chandler, D. D., *Oxon.*, of Elizabethtown, New Jersey, whose acknowledged abilities and earnest piety pointed him out as the one on whom this honor should be bestowed. But the ravages of incurable disease were even then threatening his life, and although he was spared for several years, he was averse to accepting an appointment, the duties of which it would be impossible for him to fulfil. It is said that, at the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury to suggest one of his brethren to fill the place, he named his friend and former associate in the ministry in America, the late rector of Trinity, New York. On August 12, 1787, Dr. Charles Inglis was consecrated first Bishop of Nova Scotia and almost directly proceeded to his see. Shortly after his arrival in America he addressed the following letter to Bishop White:—

HALIFAX, *Decem. 10th, 1787.*

MY GOOD BROTHER WHITE:—Some weeks before my departure from London, I received a friendly letter from you, which you wrote some time after your arrival at Philadelphia; & for which I should have returned my best thanks had not extreme hurry & a press of business while I was in England prevented me. I now thank you heartily for it; & do assure you that nothing shall be wanting on my part to cultivate hereafter the most friendly & brotherly intercourse with my Right Reverend Brethren in the American States.

You have probably heard of my appointment as Bishop of Nova Scotia, & my arrival at this place. After many delays of office, to which my patent was subject, & much fatigue in forming the arrangements for a new Diocese, I was consecrated at Lambeth on Sunday the 12th of August—embarked for America the 28th of the same month, & arrived at Halifax October 15th. I found the state of this province nearly such as I imagine you found that of your Diocese—in great want of the superintending care and inspection of a Bishop; & much need I have of the divine aid to enable me to discharge the duties of this Station—much prudence, judgment, temper & zeal guided by discretion are required. Nova Scotia is properly my Diocese. I have the same authority given me over the Clergy that Bishops have in England over their Clergy; but the temporal powers vested in English Bishops by the Constitution are withheld; & this by my own choice, for I drew up the plan that was adopted. By another Patent of a later date, directed to me as Bishop of Nova Scotia, the same authority over the Clergy of New Brunswick, Canada & Newfoundland, is given me, that was granted before over the clergy of this

Province. For there are two patents, which I should have mentioned before — one is during my life, by which this Province is constituted a Bishop's See, & I am appointed the first Bishop; the other is during the King's pleasure, & granting me the same authority with the former. This was a prudent measure & intended to facilitate the appointment of Bishops in those other provinces when it would be found expedient.

How do matters go on in your department in the States? Has the business been yet fully adjusted relative to the Common Prayer Book & Articles? What is become of the Bishop Elect of Virginia? I heard nothing of him in England. I made many inquiries in London for Usher's tract intituled "The reduction of Episcopacy to the form of Synodical Government," in order to send it to you but could not, with all my endeavours procure it. However I have the book here which contains it, & if you desire it I shall either send you the book by some safe hand; or else have the tract, which is very short, transcribed for your use.

I beg you will present my best compliments to Mrs. White, also to Mr. Wynkoop & family. If Mrs. Vining be in Philadelphia, remember me affectionately to her & Miss Vining. My extreme hurry at present prevents me from mentioning several particulars which I wished to communicate. I shall be always ready by every method in my power, to convince you that I am with great esteem, & with sincere wishes for your success

Right Reverend Sir

Your affectionate Brother

& humble Servant

CHARLES NOVA SCOTIA.

Right Reverend Bishop WHITE.

Following this letter in the Bishop White Correspondence, whence these interesting communications from the newly made Bishop are found, is an interesting picture of the relations existing between the clergy of the Province and their head, the details of which are most creditable to the wisdom and piety of the writer.

FREDERICTON, NEW BRUNSWICK, *Aug. 7, 1788.*

MY GOOD BROTHER WHITE: — I have been long indebted to you for your friendly letter of last February, which I would have long since answered had a conveyance offered: but the truth is, I did not hear of any vessel but one going from Halifax to Philadelphia, since your letter came to hand; nor did I hear of her until some days after she had sailed. Finding on my coming to this place, that the Rev'd Mr. Clarkson (lately married to Miss Cooke) is about to embark for

Philadelphia, I very gladly embrace the opportunity to thank you for your letter, to assure of my best wishes and esteem, and that it will afford me unfeigned pleasure to keep up a brotherly intercourse — such as should subsist between persons embarked in the same cause, and interested in each others success. For although the form of your Civil Government be changed, yet our church is the same, and I feel as much anxiety as ever for its prosperity in the Colonies, now States of America.

On looking into Collier's Eccles. Hist. I find he has given the substance of A. Bishop Usher's plan of Church Government, which that great and excellent prelate to the then troubled state of the nation. But if the Tract itself would give you any further satisfaction, I would either have it transcribed for you, or send the book by some safe hand. I am not clear that the plan is reduceble to practise among you, though it gives some good hints that might be of service. Although I have many difficulties to struggle with here, yet I apprehend you have much greater (under which I pray the Almighty to support and direct you). The Government is entirely on my side and no powerful faction can be formed against me ; with respect to you, Government can at best be only neutral ; and you may justly expect opposition from other denominations — with respect to both, ecclesiastical matters are in a sad state of derangement, and the Episcopal Church is to be raised as it were from the foundation. A spirit of innovation has taken place with you, and which I trust you will be able to check, for without a check, there is no saying where it will end. I have nothing of this sort, thank God, to disturb me — my business is to keep matters in the good old way, which will not cost me much trouble ; for neither clergy nor laity discover any inclination to deviate in any material point from the established Liturgy.

Last June I held my Primary Visitation at Halifax ; and observed the same mode that is followed in England. I had previously sent a number of Questions to the Clergy relative to their Churches and the state of their Missions. The Visitation held five days, on each of which I appointed a preacher. I delivered a charge to the clergy, after sermon, on the first day — on one of the days I administered Confirmation, and on the Sunday that intervened, the Sacrament was administered. All this gave a solemnity to our proceedings, which I trust will have a good — it seemed to make a sensible impression on the people. Many communicants, advanced in age, expressed a desire to be confirmed and I did not think it right to refuse this desire, but admitted them, as you had done in the like case before. Some weeks previous to my visitation, I had preached on confirmation ; and this sermon had the desired effect — many who thought nothing of it before, resolved to be confirmed.

Soon after my Visitation, I set out on a tour to visit the several Missions in Nova Scotia and this province. More than a month has elapsed since I left Halifax, from which I am now distant more than three hundred miles. The time was employed in travelling and adjusting matters at each Church. *Here* I shall hold a confirmation in two or three days — there are five other places where I shall confirm on my way home ; so that it will be near the latter end of September before I reach Halifax. This province and many of the settlements in Nova Scotia are in their infancy — several new Churches are building — I laid the corner stone of one on my way here, and shall do the same for another on my way back.

Agreeably to the practice in England and the real nature of the case I have adopted the word *Visitation*, to express that meeting of the Clergy which I authoritatively called and convened. I find you still continue the word *Convention*, which we formerly applied to voluntary meetings of the Clergy in America, when there was no Bishop. Probably your situation requires this, but I submit it to your consideration whether it would not be advisable to keep up and express as far as prudence and circumstances will admit, that authority which Scripture and our Church allowed to the Episcopal order, and which seems essential to the welfare and good government of the Church — and whether it would not be right to hold *Visitations*, properly so called, and *Cite* the Clergy to them in the accustomed mode. I am sensible that the civil power lends you no authority, and that the submission of the Clergy is chiefly voluntary, for the present. But attention should be paid to the subject I have mentioned which, if attained, would contribute greatly to order and good government, and so the advantage of religion, for my views extend no further than to these, and to the authority allowed by scripture to our order, for the attainment of them. If I thought a copy of the Questions I sent to the clergy, and of my other proceedings, would be of any service to you, I would willingly transmit them to you. Perhaps I should remind you, that I refer to the Clergy of your own Diocese when speaking of *Visitations*. On great National Questions and Regulations, when Bishops and other Clergymen are convened from other Provinces, the case is different — that is properly a Synod or Convention, where the procedure should vary, yet the Bishops should not forget even then what is due to their order. A stranger who read this letter would be apt to think I am an asserter of high Episcopal prerogative.

But my Clergy will unanimously testify that nothing of this appears in my conduct — I treat them as brethren — give them every assistance and consolation in my power — live in love and harmony with them, and use no other expedients than persuasion and example in the exercise of my authority, and they in return neither dispute that

authority, nor wish, so far I know, to detract from it. In short, I claim no authority or prerogative for Bishops than what is warranted by the inspired Scriptures, by the Christian Church at all times, and by our own Church in particular; and which I conceive to be conducive to the advancement of true religion, order, and Godliness.

It will give me real pleasure to hear from your proceedings, and favour me with any publications relative to the Church that may appear among you from time to time. I shall do the same to you. These two provinces will fully employ my present summer — should I live until next summer, I intend, God willing to visit Canada. I beg you will present my best compliments to Mrs. White — also to my old friend Mr. Wynkoop, and to Mrs. Vining and her daughter, if they are at Philadelphia, also to Mrs. Magaw and Mrs. Blackwell. With sincere best wishes for your happiness, and fervent prayers to Almighty God for his blessing on your labours

I am

My good Brother,

Your affectionate Brother

and humble Servant

CHARLES NOVA SCOTIA.

Right Reverend Bishop WHITE.

Another letter of a similar nature follows, with glimpses of the Episcopal life of this pioneer Colonial Bishop.

HALIFAX, May 6th, 1789.

MY GOOD BROTHER: — I am favoured with your letter of December 9th last, which came to hand soon after the spring opened, and return you many thanks for the friendly communications contained in it. This brotherly intercourse is not only agreeable to my inclinations, but it appears well in the sight of others, and may be attended with advantages to both.

Herewith you will receive Usher's *scheme* which I have had transcribed for your use. That you may have a view of my proceedings here, I also enclose to you my first circular letter: my questions to the several Clergymen in this Diocese, previous to my visitation; and the same questions were sent to the Clergy of Quebec and New Brunswick, with a small alteration in the preamble, and my primary charge, which has been lately printed. The account of Sunday schools in the appendix may be of some use to you if you have thoughts of setting such institutions on foot. The Academy mentioned also in the appendix is now erected into a college, and the Legislature has granted the sum of £400 stir. a year and in perpetuity for its support besides other bequests. This is gaining a good point; but it has cost me much labor and trouble.

From the opinion I have of your prudence and judgment I doubt not that you have hitherto pursued the best steps that your situation would admit, and as you seem desirous of knowing my sentiments on the subject of conventions and visitations I shall take the liberty of setting down briefly what occurs to me after making this one observation, that the state of things being very much changed in your parts since I left New York, I can be only an imperfect judge of the propriety of particular measures.

It is certainly expedient that you should have fixed canons and regulations which are essential to preserve order. This can only be made by General Conventions or synods of the Clergy, to which, it seems, several Laymen are joined by your constitution. When those Canons are formed the Conventions will become less necessary, and as far as I am able to judge Parochial Visitations where the Clergy of neighboring districts assemble, to whom the Bishop delivers a charge and holds a confirmation at the same time are the most eligible, and will be of most service in America. I could say much on this subject and adduce such arguments in support of this opinion, as I think would induce you to adopt it. But I really have not time now to enlarge, and it is probable that your own good sense and discernment preclude the necessity of adducing those arguments. It is absolutely necessary that confirmation should be administered in different parts wherever there are members of our Church. This act is purely Episcopal. Much solemnity will be added to it by holding a visitation at the same time and by having a sermon preached each day whilst the visitation lasts. This method I took here ; it had many good effects, and I shall observe it in future. All the Clergy of Pennsylvania or of this Province do not amount to half or perhaps quarter the number of Clergymen that sometimes meet at a visitation in England. We act on a small scale as yet in this country, although we are fond of sounding names. At my visitation here, and by the answers then returned to my questions, I gained more information of the state and circumstances of the several Missions and Parishes than I could learn in twenty Conventions, as formerly held in America.

The less you depart from the old Liturgy, Articles, and Constitution or in other words, the fewer innovations you make, the better, — the more you are united, and the more extensive that union is, the better also. If practicable, all the members of the Church, through all your part of the Continent, should have one Liturgy, one set of Articles, one mode of Government. The nearer you keep to the old standard, in each, this union will be the more likely to be effected ; and I am apprehensive that you will find your united efforts little enough to stem the opposition that you may meet with from various quarters ; for after the late ferment has subsided and things return to their natural

level, old prejudices will revive, and you will be called on to defend both your principles and polity.

In a day or two, I am to embark on board of Frigate that is ordered to carry me to Quebec. My intention is to go up the River S. Lawrence as far as Montreal, afterwards hold a visitation in the city of Quebec. I shall probably hold confirmations in both those Cities. This will take up the greatest part of the summer; and I purpose, God willing, to return here the beginning of September in one of the King's ships that is ordered for the purpose.

I request that you will present my best compliments to Mrs. White, also to my worthy old friend, Mr. Wynkoop, and to Mrs. and Miss Vining, if you should see them. Does any Clergyman reside at Devon? I retain a strong affection for that place, and wish to hear that religion flourishes there.

Be so good as to favor me with any publications relative to the Church that may appear among you.

Sincerely praying that the Almighty may direct you and prosper your pious labours for the edification of His Church, I am,

Right Reverend Sir,

Your affectionate Brother  
and humble Servant,

CHARLES NOVA SCOTIA.

Right Reverend Bishop WHITE.

We have in the letter following a notice of the founding of the Academy at Windsor, out of which grew the first British Colonial College, King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia. The design of establishing an institution of learning in connection with the Church of England, in the Province of Nova Scotia, appears to have been entertained by the government as early as 1768. A plan for a collegiate school to be under Church control was submitted by the Governor and Council to the Board of Trade and Plantations in 1768, but the authorities at home deemed it best that such a scheme should proceed from private enterprise rather than from the crown, promising at the same time "liberal aid, when an institution of the kind should be set on foot."\* The following year, a plan for the accomplishment of this object was laid before the venerable Society for propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, suggesting Windsor as

\* Vide *A Brief Account of the Origin, Endowment and Progress of the University of King's College, Windsor, Nova Scotia.* By THOMAS B. AKINS, a member of the Associated Alumni. Halifax, N. S., 1865. The venerable author of this sketch, now a D. C. L. of his own University, is still living, and is still engaged in historical studies and pursuits.

the site of the proposed "seminary or college;" but the lack of funds prevented immediate action being taken by the Society, and the plan lay dormant until the close of the American war. On the removal of great numbers of loyalists from the United States after the peace of 1783, the plan of a public school was again brought forward, and together with the establishment of a Colonial Episcopate was urged by the leading refugee clergymen. The following year, the establishment of the see of Nova Scotia was determined upon, and a paper drawn up by Dr. Shute Barrington, afterwards Bishop of Durham, entitled "*Thoughts on the Establishment of the Church of England in Nova Scotia,*" recommended as an essential adjunct to the Episcopate the erection and endowment of a school of learning whence the supply of Clergy might be drawn in the time to come. Dr. Inglis appears to have warmly seconded these plans even before his appointment and consecration, and in the letter to Bishop White which follows we have his own recital of the steps taken in the accomplishment of this purpose.

WINDSOR, *Sep.* 29, 1789.

RIGHT REVEREND SIR:—I wrote to you last spring a few days before I embarked for Quebec. I hope the letter, accompanied with various enclosures, had reached you. Through the blessing of God, I got back safe to Halifax the latter end of August, and found it necessary to undertake a journey through this Diocese, a few days after, on various articles of public business.

I have got this far on my way home to Halifax, distant 45 miles. Windsor is a Sea port town, most beautifully situated on a river that falls into the Basin of Minas; the country about it well improved and fertile. Here stands our Academy and here our future college is to be erected. This week I shall lay the corner stone of the new church, which we intend shall be of Brick; and as I always thought the best Brick in America were made at Philadelphia, I take the liberty of requesting you to inquire whether we may have from thence a proper person to undertake the business, and on what terms he will make and lay the Brick by the thousand, the Brick to be 9 inches long, 4½ inches broad, and 2½ inches thick.

The person who undertakes it must be such, that we can rely on his judgment and skill, as well as honesty and fidelity. The Bricks should be hard, so as to be durable and bear the weather. What I want to know is, how much per thousand the person will afford such Brick for, he procuring wood to burn them; or how much per thousand he will burn them for, we finding the wood for fuel; also, how

much per thousand will he lay them for, we finding home. It will be best for you to consult with some of your friends who are acquainted with men of this description, and when you know their terms, you will oblige me by communicating the same as soon as possible.

The foundation of the Church will be laid this autumn — next spring we shall want the Brick, and the number of one hundred and fifty thousand at least will be required. By the time our Church is finished, I expect we shall be ready to set about building our College, which is also to be of Brick, and upwards of half a million — perhaps a million — will be required for this purpose. Should the person who builds the Church acquit himself to our satisfaction he may have the building of the College also.

I am informed that at a late Convention of the Episcopal Clergy, it was agreed to receive Bishop Seabury and unite with him as a regularly Consecrated Bishop. This intelligence gave me infinite pleasure. It will conduce much to the interest of the Episcopal Church.

My best compliments wait on Mrs. White — write home soon. In great haste

I am your affectionate Brother

CHARLES NOVA SCOTIA.

Right Reverend Bishop WHITE.

Quite an interval of time elapsed ere the correspondence between the two prelates appears to have been resumed. The letter following is, like its predecessors, interesting and characteristic, and exhibits its writer in a most favorable light.

CLERMONT IN NOVA SCOTIA, *June 13th, 1796.*

RIGHT REVEREND SIR, — My son will have the honour of presenting this to you. He is about to embark for New York on a visit to his relations there; and as he has expressed a desire of seeing Philadelphia before his return, I avail myself of the opportunity of introducing him to you; for although you saw him in London, he is so much grown & altered since, that you will scarcely know him. My intention is to send him to Oxford to finish his education, as soon as this horrid war is over; & I was desirous that he might see some part of America — its two principal cities at least — before he goes to England.

I have also to thank you for your last letter in answer to mine, enquiring after my friends soon after the calamitous disorder which swept off so many of the citizens of Philadelphia. It afforded me the truest pleasure to learn that they had mostly escaped, & that so few of them had fallen victims on the occasion. I sincerely wish & hope that you may be long preserved from a similar calamity. Since writing to you last, I have moved into the country. The bleak air of

Halifax, standing on the margin of the Ocean, disagreed with me much, & I was under the necessity of trying what effect a change of situation would produce. I removed to this place, where I have purchased lands & built a house. The situation is elevated & dry, the air clear as any in America, & the roads for many miles all around me, as good as any Turnpike in England. A twelvemonth has elapsed since my removal, & it has fully answered my most sanguine expectations; for I now feel better, thank God, than I have been any summer for twenty years past. The Episcopal Church in the American States has sustained a great loss, in the death of my old friend Bishop Seabury. He was a worthy man of very respectable abilities & excellent principles. I have not heard who is to succeed him in Connecticut. The number of Bishops in the States is now considerably increased, which gives me sincere pleasure; as it indicates a flourishing state of the Church, and will be a security to it against the ruinous effects of infidelity and enthusiasm, so prevalent in these times, and equally destructive to rational religion, & to the welfare of Society. Atheism has been attended with such terrible consequences in Europe, that we should dread its prevalence more than that of any pestilence. — I pray God to preserve this Continent from its direful effects — it militates no less against man's temporal than his eternal happiness.

My Colleague the Bishop of Quebec is a most amiable & respectable character; but unfortunately the great distance between us precludes any other intercourse than by letter. This is an inconvenience which I very much lament; for many advantages besides the satisfaction would accrue from a personal intercourse & mutual communication of advice & counsel. Your situation in this respect is preferable to ours. — With you several Bishops frequently meet, & consult each other.

By this conveyance I write to Mr. Wynkoop, who I hope is still alive & well. Please to present my best compliments to Mrs. White, & believe me to be with the truest esteem

Right Reverend Sir

Your affectionate brother

& faithful humble servant

CHARLES NOVA SCOTIA.

P. S. Be so good as to present my best compliments to Dr. Morgan. I am preparing to set out for Halifax with one of my daughters, when the others with my son set out for New York, which hurries me so much that I am not able to write to him, or else I would willingly do it. Remember me also to Dr. Smith. Are his sermons yet published? I have not heard from our friend Duché this long time; nor do I even know in what part of England he is settled at present.

Right Reverend Bishop WHITE.

The correspondence thus revived by the visit of Mr., subsequently Bishop, John Inglis to Philadelphia was continued on the return of the latter to his home, and the letter we subjoin exhibits the full renewal of the old time confidences, and affectionate interest and regard.

CLERMONT, *April 8, 1797.*

RIGHT REVEREND & DEAR SIR :— I have been favoured with your very kind letter of August 9th by my son, & beg leave to return you my sincere thanks for your politeness to him while he was at Philadelphia. He is constantly mentioning the kind treatment he received from you, & the pleasure he had in your family.

Be pleased also to accept my thanks for the journals of your Convention, which I wished to have, & for two valuable tracts that accompanied them ; one a sermon by yourself — the other by Dr. Wharton — both of which I read with much pleasure. Dr. Wharton appears to be a man of sense & learning, & discovers a considerable share of critical knowledge in the holy Scriptures.

I am sincerely glad to hear that Ecclesiastical Discipline is supported with so much Spirit by your Convention, as in the case of Dr. Purcele. It is happy that irregularities are so earnestly taken up by the members of the Lower House, Clergy & Laymen. My fear was, that the American Bishops would not be properly supported in exertions of Authority, when necessary ; but I rejoice that my fears have proved groundless. The most beneficial consequences may & I trust will result from it to Religion & the Episcopal Church. Since my appointment to this Diocese only one instance has occurred, which called for my interference in a judicial way — it was that of a missionary, who had been for many years a notorious Drunkard & whom I dismissed, after a long & solemn scrutiny, from the Society's service. I was assisted by two Clergymen ; & it was the most painful undertaking I ever went through. For sake of my own feelings, as well as of Religion, I sincerely hope & wish I may never have such an other task.

Most cordially do I rejoice with you at the prospect of a firm, friendly & durable intercourse between our countries, and that the Americans have escaped the machinations of French Incendiaries, who seem to delight in mischief, & involving others in the same ruin with themselves. That wretched nation is much to be pitied. It exhibits to mankind an awful lesson of what may be expected when the sacred truths of Religion are trampled on, and all the restraints on lawless Ambition are thrown aside. No person can more sincerely deprecate the present war, or more ardently wish for peace than I do ; & yet I think we are in less danger from French violence and arms,

than from French principles. May heaven avert them & their consequences from you and us. Our consolation is, that there is an Almighty, beneficent Being who presides over the earth — that human depravity and ambition, like the Ocean, have their limits which they cannot pass — that the disorders occasioned by them cannot defeat the purposes of heaven ; nor even retard the progress of that stupendous plan, which will certainly terminate in exaltation of the Redeemer, the felicity of his faithful servants & punishment of his enemies.

The first certain information that I had of my dear worthy friend, Mr. Duché, being at Philadelphia & of his feeble state of health, was from my son after seeing him at his own house. His character, temper, manners & disposition were truly amiable, & I most sincerely loved him. After saying this, it is needless to tell you how tenderly I sympathise with him & his family. I request that you will remember me to him most affectionately, and also to Mrs. Duché & the young ladies. In his native city, & among such of his friends as remain, I hope he will find all the comfort & satisfaction that his situation will admit of. Were it in my power I would most gladly visit him.

In my last I told you that the want of health at Halifax obliged me to move into the country. In this retirement with my family and books I enjoy, thank God, a degree of health and tranquility to which I have been a stranger for many years. I have also more leisure for those literary pursuits which my station requires, & which from inclination and habit are now become my greatest amusement and gratification. My son requests me to present his affectionate compliments to you, Mrs. White, & the young ladies, of whom he talks much. I beg you will present mine to Mrs. White and to believe that I am with the truest esteem,

Right Reverend Sir,

Your affectionate brother

& faithful humble servant,

CHARLES NOVA SCOTIA.

The close of the century brought to Bishop White the last of these letters from his brother of Nova Scotia which has been preserved. We give it with regret that no more of these interesting records of the life and work of the first British colonial prelate are within our reach. Few of the letters written in an age when epistolary communications were of an importance and interest far exceeding that which is possible in our days, are more worthy of preservation, or do more credit to their writer, than these unstudied epistles which appear in print for

the first time, in most cases, in this contribution to the life of the first Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia. We submit these transcripts as a humble tribute to the memory of him who, one hundred years ago, was made, by the laying on of hands and prayer, the first Bishop of the British Colonial Church.

CLERMONT, *April 10, 1799.*

RIGHT REVEREND SIR : — My son is just setting out from home to embark at Halifax for New York, where he is called by business, and I could not omit the opportunity of writing a line to inquire about your health, and that of your family ; for it is probable that he will now as formerly proceed as far South as Philadelphia.

It was with the truest concern that I heard of the ravages made by the Yellow Fever in your city last summer. I fervently pray that this dreadful malady may no more return, as it threatens desolation to the great towns on the American Sea-Coast. I understand the disorder is now considered as rather endemial and not contagious or pestilential. If so, ways and means may be found to avoid it, or at least to abate its malignity. It was your wish, My Good Brother, as well as mine, that all animosity and prejudice between British subjects and Americans might cease, and that their former habits of mutual good will and friendship might return. This has in some measure happened. A great revolution has taken place in the sentiments of your people with respect to England and France, and the French have kindly assisted in bringing about that revolution. Their horrid impiety and anarchy, their perfidy and unbounded tyrannical ambition have disgusted every other people as well as the Americans. It is a matter of real joy to me that America has had the good sense, virtue, and firmness to disengage itself from the gripe, and therefore to avoid the disgrace and ruin which are sure to attend a connection with that detestable Republic. America has now connected itself a Treaty of amity and commerce, with a nation that seems destined by Providence to support the cause of religion, order and humanity on this earth ; and to check the progress of atheism, anarchy and barbarism. This may be justly said of the British nation, which now singly opposes, and sustains the vengeful efforts of a power, before which the rest of Europe trembled, and which shook almost every other state there to its centre. But God forbid that I should vainly boast of human strength and prowess. This is the LORD's doing. That Providence which guides the springs of universal nature, and steadily directs all events to effect its gracious purposes, is hereby carrying on those designs which are foretold in Divine Revelation, and conducting matters to that awful display of grandeur and power, of justice and mercy, and of faithful-

ness and truth, which is to precede the concluding drama of this world. Not that I suppose this conclusion is at the door and just approaching, for many great events must first take place; and things seem to be in train and preparing for it. Men are merely secondary instruments and causes in effecting those designs.

When my son came last from Philadelphia, you were pleased to favour me with several excellent pamphlets and sermons — the latter of your own composition. Since my arrival here, I have published several occasional sermons, and charges to the Clergy every third year, till I moved into the country for my health. Two of the sermons, and one of the charges, the only copies that I can lay my hands on, with an account of the Sunday Schools which I opened at Halifax, now beg your acceptance. If there is any late publication with you, especially that relates to the state of religion in America, I shall be obliged to you for mentioning it to my Son that he may procure it. The French principles I fear have shed much of their poison with you as well as with us; however the French ambition, cruelty, and tyranny may be detested. I am sorry to learn that Virginia has largely imbibed those principles — the consequences are such as might be expected — religion is there discouraged, and Jacobinism threatens a rupture of the American Union.

I pray God to preserve and bless you, and am with the truest esteem,  
Right Reverend Sir, Your affectionate Brother and faithful, humble servant,

CHARLES NOVA SCOTIA.

Right Reverend Dr. WHITE.

We may add to what has already been stated with reference to this interesting correspondence, that the chirography of Bishop Charles Inglis is exceedingly neat, readable, and correct, the style and finish of his letters being cultured and indicative of the gentleman and scholar. Written in evident haste, amidst many interruptions, often on journeys and with infelicitous surroundings, they are among the most attractive MSS. in the voluminous correspondence of the first Bishop of Pennsylvania. No one on examining these letters would for a minute doubt the mental powers and cultivated instincts of the gifted writer.

WILLIAM STEVENS PERRY.

# THE LAW OF THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

## CHAPTER V.

### GENESIS OF THE CONSTITUTION.

#### *Amendments and Alterations made in the Conventions of 1786 and 1789.*

THE next meeting of the Convention was on Tuesday, June 20, 1786, in Christ Church, Philadelphia. Clerical and Lay Deputies were present from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, and South Carolina, and Clerical Deputies only from Maryland. On the following Friday the "Journals of the late Conventions and the proposed Constitution of the Church were read for the first time." Previous to a second reading a Memorial from New Jersey was received and referred to the first General Convention that should assemble with power to act on the same. The following extract from the Journal will show what changes and on whose motion they were made : —

The proposed Constitution was then taken up for a second reading, and debated by paragraphs.

The Preamble, contained in three clauses or sections, was agreed to without alteration.

Sect. I. 'Of the Constitution.' On motion by the Rev. Mr. Smith of South Carolina the triennial meetings of the General Convention were changed from the third Tuesday in June to the fourth Tuesday in July.

Sect. II. After the words 'of each Order,' insert 'chosen by the Convention of each State.'

Sect. III. Agreed to.

Sect. IV. Agreed to.

Sect. V. From the words 'This general Ecclesiastical Constitution,' dele the word 'general,' and insert the same before the word 'Convention,' in the next line, and the sentence will run thus : 'he

shall be considered as a member of the General Convention *ex officio*.'

On motion by Dr. White, seconded by Mr. Beach. After the words '*ex officio*,' add — 'and a Bishop shall always preside in the General Convention, if any of the Episcopal Order be present.'

Sect. VI. Dele the words 'by the respective Conventions' and insert 'by the Convention of that State.' After the words 'to ordain or confirm,' insert 'or perform any other act of the Episcopal office.'

Sect. VII. Agreed to.

Sect. VIII. On motion by Dr. White, seconded by the Rev. Mr. Beach. After the words 'equitable mode of trial,' add these words — 'And at every trial of a Bishop, there shall be one or more of the Episcopal Order present; and none but a Bishop shall pronounce sentence of deposition or degradation from the Ministry on any Clergyman, whether Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon.'

Nicholas Ridgely, Esq., a Deputy from the State of Delaware, attended, and after producing the testimonials of his appointment, took his seat in Convention.

Adjourned to 6 o'clock in the evening.

FRIDAY EVENING.

At 6 o'clock the Convention met.

The Rev. Sydenham Thorne, a Deputy from the State of Delaware, exhibited his credentials, and took his seat in Convention.

The debates on the Constitution were renewed and continued.

Sect. IX. Instead of the words, 'to be the desire,' insert 'to be the general desire.' After the words, 'therefore the,' dele the whole subsequent part of the section, and in place thereof insert as follows: 'Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, as revised and proposed to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at a Convention of the said Church, in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina, may be used by this Church in such of the States as have adopted, or may adopt, the same in their particular Conventions, till further provision is made in this case, by the first General Convention which shall assemble with sufficient power to ratify a Book of Common Prayer for the Church in these States.'

Sect. X. Dele the whole of this section, and in place thereof insert as follows:—

'No person shall be ordained until due examination had by the Bishop and two Presbyters, and exhibiting testimonials of his moral conduct for three years past, signed by the Minister and a majority of the Vestry of the Church where he last resided; or permitted to officiate as a Minister in this Church until he has exhibited his Let-

ters of Ordination and subscribed the following declaration : " I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of GOD, and to contain all things necessary to salvation ; and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States."

Sect. XI. Dele the whole, and in place thereof insert as follows :—

'This Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, when ratified by the Church in a majority of the States, assembled in General Convention, with sufficient power for the purpose of such ratification, shall be unalterable, by the Convention of any particular State, which hath been represented at the time of said ratification.'

From the title of the Constitution dele the word 'Ecclesiastical.'

The question being then put on the whole of the proposed Constitution, as now amended, the same was unanimously agreed to as follows :—

A GENERAL CONSTITUTION OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH  
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Whereas, in the course of Divine Providence, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is become independent of all foreign authority, civil and ecclesiastical ;—

And whereas, at a meeting of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the said Church in sundry of the said States, viz., in the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, held in the City of New York on the 6th and 7th days of October, in the year of Our LORD 1784, it was recommended to this Church in the said States represented as aforesaid, and proposed to this Church in the States not represented, that they should send deputies to a Convention to be held in the City of Philadelphia, on the Tuesday before the Feast of St. Michael, in the year of Our LORD 1785, in order to unite in a Constitution of Ecclesiastical government, agreeably to certain fundamental principles, expressed in the said recommendation and proposal ;

And whereas, in consequence of the said recommendation and proposal, Clerical and Lay Deputies have been duly appointed from the said Church in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina ;

The said Deputies being now assembled, and taking into consideration the importance of maintaining uniformity in doctrine, discipline, and worship in the said Church, do hereby determine and declare :

I. That there shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, which shall be held in the City of Philadelphia, on the third Tuesday in June, in the

year of our LORD, 1786, and forever after once in three years, on the fourth Tuesday in July, in such place as shall be determined by the Convention; and special meetings may be held at such other times, and in such place, as shall be hereafter provided for. And this Church, in a majority of the States aforesaid, shall be represented before they shall proceed to business, except that the representation of this Church from two States shall be sufficient to adjourn. And in all business of the Convention, freedom of debate shall be allowed.

II. There shall be a representation of both Clergy and Laity of the Church in each State, which shall consist of one or more Deputies, not exceeding four, of each Order, chosen by the Convention of each State; and in all questions the said Church in each State shall have but one vote, and a majority of suffrages shall be conclusive.

III. In the said Church, in every State represented in this Convention, there shall be a Convention consisting of the Clergy and Lay Deputies of the congregations.

IV. 'The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England,' shall be continued to be used by this Church, as the same is altered by this Convention, in a certain instrument of writing passed by their authority, entitled 'Alterations of the Liturgy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in order to render the same conformable to the American Revolution and the Constitutions of the respective States.'

V. In every State where there shall be a Bishop duly consecrated and settled, who shall have acceded to the articles of this Ecclesiastical Constitution, he shall be considered as a member of the General Convention *ex officio*; and a Bishop shall always preside in the General Convention, if any of the Episcopal Order be present.

VI. The Bishop or Bishops in every State shall be chosen agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the Convention of that State; and every Bishop of this Church shall confine the exercise of his Episcopal office to his proper jurisdiction, unless requested to ordain or confirm, or perform any other act of the Episcopal office, by any Church destitute of a Bishop.

VII. A Protestant Episcopal Church, in any of the United States not now represented, may at any time hereafter be admitted, on acceding to the articles of this union.

VIII. Every Clergyman, whether Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon, shall be amenable to the authority of the Convention in the State to which he belongs, so far as relates to suspension or removal from office; and the Convention in each State shall institute rules for their conduct, and an equitable mode of trial. And at every trial of a

Bishop, there shall be one or more of the Episcopal Order present, and none but a Bishop shall pronounce sentence of deposition or degradation from the ministry on any Clergyman, whether Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon.

IX. And whereas it is represented to this Convention to be the general desire of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these States, that there may be further alterations of the Liturgy than such as are made necessary by the American Revolution, — therefore 'The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, as revised and proposed to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at a Convention of the said Church, in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina,' may be used by the Church in such of the States as have adopted, or may adopt, the same in their particular Conventions, till further provision is made, in this case, by the first General Convention, which shall assemble with sufficient power to ratify a Book of Common Prayer for the Church in these States.

X. No person shall be ordained, until due examination had by the Bishop and two Presbyters, and exhibiting testimonials of his moral conduct for three years past, signed by the Minister and a majority of the Vestry of the Church where he has last resided; or permitted to officiate as a Minister in this Church, until he has exhibited his Letters of Ordination and subscribed the following declaration: 'I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to our salvation; and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States.'

XI. The Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, when ratified by the Church in a majority of the States assembled in General Convention, with sufficient power for the purpose of such ratification, shall be unalterable by the Convention of any particular State, which hath been represented at the time of such ratification. [Perry's Reprint of *Journals of General Conventions*, vol. i. pp. 38-42.]

The next Convention assembled in Wilmington, Delaware, Tuesday, October 10, of the same year. On the first day of the Convention the reply of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Committee of the General Convention at Philadelphia was read. They called attention to a defect in the Constitution that has never yet been corrected. It has led to injustice and disquiet in the Church, and must sooner or later be remedied. The Archbishops in their reply say:—

We should be inexcusable, too, if, at the time when you are request-

ing the establishment of Bishops in your Church, we did not strongly represent to you that the Eighth Article of your Ecclesiastical Constitution appears to us to be a degradation of the Clerical, and still more of the Episcopal character. We persuade ourselves, that in your ensuing Convention some alteration will be thought necessary in this article before this reaches you ; or, if not, that due attention will be given to it in consequence of our representation.

In considering this part of the Archbishop's reply it was "unanimously determined" not to change the Eighth Article.

The next Convention assembled in Christ Church, Philadelphia, July 28, 1789. The first action taken relating to the Constitution was on Saturday, August 1. "The Rev. Dr. Smith, from the Committee appointed to take into consideration the proposed Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and to recommend such alterations, additions, or amendments as they shall think necessary and proper, reported a Constitution for the same." It was ordered that the Constitution be read, and, after a second reading, it was debated by paragraphs, and,

*Resolved*, That the 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 articles be adopted, and stand in this order : 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ; that they be a rule of conduct for this Convention ; and that the remaining articles be postponed for the future consideration of this Convention.

August 7. "The Convention took into consideration the two Articles of the Constitution which had been postponed, and which they amended and agreed to," and it was "Ordered that the Constitution be engrossed for signing," and on the following day it was "read and signed by the Convention ; and is as follows :—

A GENERAL CONSTITUTION OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH  
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

ART. 1. There shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America on the first Tuesday of August, in the year of our LORD, 1792, and on the first Tuesday of August in every third year afterwards, in such place as shall be determined by the Convention ; and special meetings may be called at other times, in the manner hereafter to be provided for ; and this Church, in a majority of the States which shall have adopted this Constitution, shall be represented, before they shall proceed to business, except that the representation from two States shall be sufficient to adjourn ; and in all business of the Convention freedom of debate shall be allowed.

ART. 2. The Church in each State shall be entitled to a representation of both the Clergy and the Laity, which representation shall consist of one or more Deputies, not exceeding four of each Order, chosen by the Convention of the State: and in all questions, when required by the Clerical or Lay representation from any State, each Order shall have one vote; and the majority of suffrages by States shall be conclusive in each Order, provided such majority comprehend a majority of the States represented in that Order. The concurrence of both Orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the Convention. If the Convention of any State should neglect or decline to appoint Clerical Deputies, or if they should neglect or decline to appoint Lay Deputies, or if any of those of either Order appointed should neglect to attend, or be prevented by sickness or any other accident, such State shall nevertheless be considered as duly represented by such Deputy or Deputies as may attend, whether lay or clerical. And if, through the neglect of the Convention of any of the Churches which shall have adopted, or may hereafter adopt this Constitution, no Deputies, either Lay or Clerical, should attend at any General Convention, the Church in such State shall nevertheless be bound by the acts of such Convention.

ART. 3. The Bishops of this Church, when there shall be three or more, shall, whenever General Conventions are held, form a House of revision; and when any proposed act shall have passed in the General Convention, the same shall be transmitted to the House of revision for their concurrence. And if the same shall be sent back to the Convention, with the negative or non-concurrence of the House of revision, it shall be again considered in the General Convention, and if the Convention shall adhere to the said act by a majority of three fifths of their body, it shall become a law to all intents and purposes, notwithstanding the non-concurrence of the House of revision; and all acts of the Convention shall be authenticated by both Houses. And in all cases, the House of Bishops shall signify to the Convention their approbation or disapprobation, the latter with their reasons in writing, within two days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence, and in failure thereof it shall have the operation of a law. But until there shall be three or more Bishops as aforesaid, any Bishop attending a General Convention shall be a member ex officio, and shall vote with the Clerical Deputies of the State to which he belongs. And a Bishop shall then preside.

ART. 4. The Bishop or Bishops in every State shall be chosen agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the Convention of that State. And every Bishop of this Church shall confine the exercise of his Episcopal office to his proper Diocese or District, unless requested to ordain or confirm, or perform any other act of the Episcopal office, by any Church destitute of a Bishop.

ART. 5. A Protestant Episcopal Church in any of the United States not now represented, may, at any time hereafter, be admitted, on acceding to this Constitution.

ART. 6. In every State, the mode of trying Clergymen shall be instituted by the Convention of the Church therein. At every trial of a Bishop there shall be one or more of the Episcopal Order present: and none but a Bishop shall pronounce sentence of deposition or degradation from the Ministry on any Clergyman, whether Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon.

ART. 7. No person shall be admitted to Holy Orders, until he shall have been examined by the Bishop and by two Presbyters, and shall have exhibited such testimonials and other requisites as the Canons in that case provided may direct. Nor shall any person be ordained until he shall have subscribed the following declaration: 'I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation: and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States.' No person ordained by a foreign Bishop shall be permitted to officiate as a Minister of this Church, until he shall have complied with the Canon or Canons in that case provided, and have also subscribed the aforesaid declaration.

ART. 8. A Book of Common Prayer, Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, Articles of Religion, and a form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, when established by this or a future General Convention, shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in these States, which shall have adopted this Constitution.

ART. 9. This Constitution shall be unalterable, unless in General Convention by the Church in a majority of the States which may have adopted the same; and all alterations shall be first proposed in one General Convention, and made known to the several State Conventions, before they shall be finally agreed to, or ratified, in the ensuing General Convention.

In consideration of certain communications from the Bishop and Clergy of the Church in Connecticut and of the Clergy in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, the Convention adjourned to the 29 of the following September. On the fourth day [October 2] of this adjourned meeting of the General Convention the Rev. Dr. William Smith, from the Committee appointed to confer with the Deputies from Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, reported as follows:—

That they have had a full, free, and friendly conference with the

Deputies of the said Churches, who, on behalf of the Church in their several States, and by virtue of sufficient authority from them, have signified, that they do not object to the Constitution, which was approved at the former session of this Convention, if the Third Article of that Constitution may be so modified as to declare explicitly the right of the Bishops, when sitting in a separate House, to originate and propose acts for concurrence of the other House of Convention ; and to negative such acts proposed by the other House as they may disapprove.

Your Committee, conceiving this alteration to be desirable in itself, as having a tendency to give greater stability to the Constitution, without diminishing any security that is now possessed by the clergy or laity ; and being sincerely impressed with the importance of a union to the future prosperity of the Church, do therefore recommend to the Convention a compliance with the wishes of their brethren, and that the Third Article of the Constitution may be altered accordingly. Upon such alteration being made, it is declared by the deputies from the Churches in the Eastern States, that they will subscribe to the Constitution, and become members of this General Convention.

Upon special motion, the above report was read a second time ; whereupon the following resolution was proposed, viz. :—

*Resolved*, That this Convention do adopt that part of the report of the Committee which proposes to modify the Third Article of the Constitution, so as to declare explicitly 'the right of the Bishops, when sitting in a separate House, to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the other House of Convention ; and to negative such acts proposed by the other House, as they may disapprove ; provided they are not adhered to by four fifths of the other House.'

After some debate, the resolution, with the proviso annexed, was agreed upon, and the Third Article was accordingly modified in the manner following, viz. :—

ART. III. The Bishops of this Church, when there shall be three or more, shall, whenever General Conventions are held, form a separate House, with the right to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the House of Deputies, composed of clergy and laity ; and when any proposed act shall have passed the House of Deputies, the same shall be transmitted to the House of Bishops, who shall have a negative thereupon, unless adhered to by four fifths of the other house ; and all acts of the Convention shall be authenticated by both houses. And, in all cases the House of Bishops shall signify to the Convention their approbation or disapprobation, the latter, with their reasons in writing, within three days after the proposed act shall

have been reported to them for concurrence ; and in failure thereof, it shall have the operation of a law. But until there shall be three or more bishops as aforesaid, any bishop attending a General Convention shall be a member, ex-officio, and shall vote with the clerical deputies of the State to which he belongs ; and a bishop shall then preside.

Bishop Seabury and the Deputies then signed the Constitution. The record is as follows :—

*October 2, 1789.*

We do hereby agree to the Constitution of the Church, as modified this day in Convention.

SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D., Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut.

ABRAHAM JARVIS, A. M., Rector of Christ Church, Middletown.

BELA HUBBARD, A. M., Rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, STATE OF CONNECTICUT.

SAMUEL PARKER, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, Boston, and Clerical Deputy for Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

This left the Constitution in the following form :—

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

ART. 1. There shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America on the second Tuesday of September, in the year of our LORD 1792, and on the second Tuesday of September in every third year afterwards, in such place as shall be determined by the Convention ; and special meetings may be called at other times, in the manner hereafter to be provided for ; and this Church, in a majority of the States which shall have adopted this Constitution, shall be represented, before they shall proceed to business, except that the representation from two States shall be sufficient to adjourn ; and in all business of the Convention, freedom of debate shall be allowed.

ART. 2. The Church in each State shall be entitled to a representation of both the Clergy and the Laity, which representation shall consist of one or more Deputies, not exceeding four of each Order, chosen by the Convention of the State : and in all questions, when required by the Clerical or Lay representation from any State, each Order shall have one vote ; and the majority of suffrages by States shall be conclusive in each Order, provided such majority compre-

hend a majority of the States represented in that Order. The concurrence of both Orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the Convention. If the Convention of any State should neglect or decline to appoint Clerical Deputies, or if they should neglect or decline to appoint Lay Deputies, or if any of those of either Order appointed should neglect to attend, or be prevented by sickness or any other accident, such State shall nevertheless be considered as duly represented by such Deputy or Deputies as may attend, whether lay or clerical. And if, through the neglect of the Convention of any of the Churches which shall have adopted, or may hereafter adopt this Constitution, no Deputies, either Lay or Clerical, should attend at any General Convention, the Church in such State shall nevertheless be bound by the acts of such Convention.

ART. 3. The Bishops of this Church, when there shall be three or more, shall, whenever General Conventions are held, form a separate House, with a right to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the House of Deputies, composed of Clergy and Laity; and when any proposed act shall have passed the House of Deputies, the same shall be transmitted to the House of Bishops, who shall have a negative thereupon unless adhered to by four fifths of the other House. And all acts of the Convention shall be authenticated by both Houses. And in all cases, the House of Bishops shall signify to the Convention their approbation or disapprobation, the latter with their reasons in writing, within three days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence, and in failure thereof it shall have the operation of a law. But until there shall be three or more Bishops as aforesaid, any Bishop attending a General Convention shall be a member *ex officio*, and shall vote with the Clerical Deputies of the State to which he belongs; and a Bishop shall then preside.

ART. 4. The Bishop or Bishops in every State shall be chosen agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the Convention of that State. And every Bishop of this Church shall confine the exercise of his Episcopal office to his proper Diocese or District, unless requested to ordain or confirm, or perform any other act of the Episcopal office, by any Church destitute of a Bishop.

ART. 5. A Protestant Episcopal Church in any of the United States not now represented, may, at any time hereafter, be admitted, on acceding to this Constitution.

ART. 6. In every State, the mode of trying Clergymen shall be instituted by the Convention of the Church therein. At every trial of a Bishop there shall be one or more of the Episcopal Order present: and none but a Bishop shall pronounce sentence of deposition or degradation from the Ministry on any Clergyman, whether Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon.

ART. 7. No person shall be admitted to Holy Orders, until he shall have been examined by the Bishop and by two Presbyters, and shall have exhibited such testimonials and other requisites as the Canons in that case provided may direct. Nor shall any person be ordained until he shall have subscribed the following declaration: "I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation: and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States." No person ordained by a foreign Bishop shall be permitted to officiate as a Minister of this Church, until he shall have complied with the Canon or Canons in that case provided, and have also subscribed the aforesaid declaration.

ART. 8. A Book of Common Prayer, Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, Articles of Religion, and a form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, when established by this or a future General Convention, shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in those States, which shall have adopted this Constitution.

ART. 9. This Constitution shall be unalterable, unless in General Convention by the Church in a majority of the States which may have adopted the same; and all alterations shall be first proposed in one General Convention, and made known to the several State Conventions, before they shall be finally agreed to, or ratified, in the ensuing General Convention.

Done in General Convention of the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church, the second day of October, 1789, and ordered to be transcribed into the Book of Records, and subscribed, which was done as follows, viz.:—

#### IN THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D., Bishop of Connecticut.

WILLIAM WHITE, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Pennsylvania.

#### IN THE HOUSE OF CLERICAL AND LAY DEPUTIES.

WILLIAM SMITH, D. D., President of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and Clerical Deputy from Maryland.

NEW HAMPSHIRE &  
MASSACHUSETTS

SAMUEL PARKER, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, Boston.

CONNECTICUT . .

BELA HUBBARD, A. M., Rector of Trinity Church, New Haven.

ABRAHAM JARVIS, A. M., Rector of Christ Church, Middletown.

- NEW YORK . . . BENJAMIN MOORE, D. D., } Assistant Ministers of  
ABRAHAM BEACH, D. D., } Trinity Church, in the  
City of New York.  
RICHARD HARRISON, Lay Deputy from the State of  
New York.
- NEW JERSEY . . . UZAL OGDEN, Rector of Trinity Church, Newark.  
WILLIAM FRAZER, A. M., Rector of St. Michael's  
Church, Trenton, and St. Andrew's Church, Amwell.  
SAMUEL OGDEN, } Lay Deputies.  
R. STRETTELL JONES, }
- PENNSYLVANIA . . SAMUEL MAGAW, D. D., Rector of St. Paul's, Philadel-  
phia.  
ROBERT BLACKWELL, D. D., Senior Assistant Minis-  
ter of Christ Church and St. Peter's, Philadelphia.  
JOSEPH G. J. BEND, Assistant Minister of Christ  
Church and St. Peter's, Philadelphia.  
JOSEPH PILMORE, Rector of the United Churches of  
Trinity, St. Thomas, and All Saints.  
GERARDUS CLARKSON, }  
TENCH COXE, } Lay Deputies from the State  
FRANCIS HOPKINSON, } of Pennsylvania.  
SAMUEL POWEL, }
- DELAWARE . . . JOSEPH COWDEN, A. M., Rector of St. Anne's.  
ROBERT CLAY, Rector of Emanuel and St. James's  
Churches.
- MARYLAND . . . JOHN BISSETT, A. M., Rector of Shrewsbury Parish,  
Kent County.  
JOHN RUMSEY, }  
CHARLES GOLDSBOROUGH, } Lay Deputies.
- VIRGINIA . . . JOHN BRACKEN, Rector of Bruton Parish, Williams-  
burg.  
ROBERT ANDREWS, Lay Deputy.
- SOUTH CAROLINA. ROBERT SMITH, D. D., Rector of St. Philip's Church,  
Charleston.  
WILLIAM SMITH, } Lay Deputies from the State of  
WILLIAM BRISBANE, } South Carolina.

Sundry other members attended this Convention at different times of sitting, but were absent on the day of signing the Constitution. See the names occasionally entered on the Journal. [Perry's Reprint of *Journals of General Conventions*, vol. i. pp. 98-102.]

HENRY MASON BAUM.

## American Contemporary Literature.

---

IN this volume of poems by Mrs. Preston\* there is considerable range of poetic feeling and expression, vivid touches of description, and much finish in versification. These verses are well worth reading, and the colonial ballads particularly are simple, pointed, and affecting. Besides the sonnets and the ballads we have a series of graceful poems called the Childhood of the Old Masters. We do not recollect having met with such expressions as "*vatic*," "*young neophyte*," elsewhere in English literature; but we are not going to carp about such trifles as these in giving our hearty praise to this volume, and in expressing the genuine pleasure with which we have studied its smooth and transparent lines.

Dr. McCosh's *Realistic Philosophy*† is an elaborate treatise, and claims the attention due to the work of an eminent teacher of philosophy and a successful educator. In the first volume the matter is expository. The whole ground of philosophical truth is reviewed from a realistic standpoint. Clearness, vigor, and confident dogmatism are characteristic of this as of all other writings of the learned author. We see plainly enough in this section of the work why Dr. McCosh is sometimes charged with sensationalism. This trend of the Professor's mind abates not a whit, however, the interest and value of the disquisition, though it may afford a handle for further controversy to adherents of other methods. In the historical and critical division of the work the dogmatic tone is even more apparent, and the German schools receive scant mercy from a trenchant sword. The amount of information, the clever summaries, the keen criticisms, of this learned and unhesitating writer, render the book well worth reading, even by those who may not see in it any great power of original thought, or who may miss in it those last graces which belong only to such writers as Berkeley, Hume, or Martineau.

\* *Colonial Ballads, Sonnets, and Other Verse.* By MARGARET J. PRESTON. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1887.

† *Realistic Philosophy defended in a Philosophic Series.* By JAMES MCCOSH, D. D., LL. D., Litt. D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

What in our mind detracts more than anything else from the value of the book as a contribution to Philosophical Science is the assumption on which the whole work is founded, namely, that there must be an American Philosophy, and that Philosophy must be a Realism. *Sic volo, sic jubeo*, says the President of Princeton. Is Dr. McCosh really in earnest when he so writes? We cannot venture to accuse him of pandering to our national vanity, and yet Epictetus says: "Rejoice not that thou art a Roman, but rather that thou art a man." It is bad enough to set up national rivalries in anything, — worst of all in Literature or in Philosophy. When the patriotic American boy asked his teacher to give him no more Shakespeare, but the lines of some American poet to learn, the teacher replied: "*Shakespeare is an American.*" Descartes thought as little of founding a French philosophy as Leibnitz did of founding a German philosophy, and after all, the Realism of Dr. McCosh, what is it but Scottish Metaphysics made easy? When Dr. McCosh or anybody else drops as large a jewel, and one that penetrates as deeply into the ocean of speculation, as the great thinkers of other times have done, all we can say is that it will make as big a ripple. But the greater the ripple the wider and more extensive will be the circle which shall spread from such a centre, and the wider it spreads the less will it be American and the more will it be claimed as the heritage of the world. There is no nationality in matters of this sort. There is neither Jew nor Greek here. Humanity is the only tie that binds men in the search for truth. Soldiers fight under the Stars and Stripes, the Union Jack, or the Tricolor, but philosophers have only one tongue and one tie of brotherhood.

Dr. W. A. Snively has published some sensible and timely observations on *Æsthetics in Worship*.\* We have here, as we might have expected, a calm, thoughtful, and conservative utterance on the subject of Ritual in our Church Service. At times Dr. Snively rises to eloquence, and is always instructive, judicious, and progressive in his remarks. The book was read (in part) at the now famous Church Congress, which met at New Haven, October, 1885, and we are not surprised that those who heard so valuable an essay, the production of so eminent an American divine, should have requested its publication. It is printed in the best style of the De Vinne Press, on rough paper, with uncut edges. The texts are in red, and it is further embellished by a beautiful title-page and vignettes, — a handsome and handy volume for a gift.

The physical and the mental faculties of men are evidently in many ways intimately related, but of the manner in which they act

\* *Æsthetics in Worship*. By W. H. SNIVELY, D. D. New York: James Pott & Co.

and react upon each other it is impossible to give any definite explanation. The phenomena of mind are plainly outside the sphere of physical science, and yet the investigation of these, which must necessarily be conducted entirely independently of mere physical observation, upon which all rational science rests, seems to have an irresistible attraction for some scientific men. "The drift and purpose of their observations and experiments seem to be actually to annihilate the relation between the mental and the physical by identifying the correlated phenomena and by resolving all mental phenomena into physical."

To counteract in some measure the influence which such men exert, and to exhibit the illogical absurdities which they can perpetrate, and the unintelligible nonsense of which they can be guilty when they step out of their proper sphere of research in which they have justly attained a high reputation, and attempt to apply the methods of physical science to metaphysical topics, is the object of a series of sermons entitled, *Religion a Revelation and a Rule of Life*.\*

The manner in which such scientists have attained their present state of antagonism to religion is an example of their own favorite theory of progress and development. The author calls attention to the three stages of this progress. "First of all for the purpose of easier examination, Science has investigated the Kosmos apart from GOD. And this manifestly in itself involves no impiety. But even in this first stage the study of nature (apart from GOD) must be highly dangerous, and may easily be fatal to religious belief and religious feeling, unless we combine with it in a sufficient degree other studies which do not omit GOD from our consideration, and unless we carefully discharge the practical duties of religion. To devote all our best energies to the discovery of what the world is, with GOD left out, is the most effective method of forgetting Him altogether. The next stage is the investigation of the world with GOD excluded. The scientist, were he ever so well inclined, cannot for the life of him discover how to get that GOD in again, whom, or which, he deliberately and provisionally left out for the sake of an easier investigation of natural and sensible phenomena."

The third and last stage of Science is also its Nemesis. The "hungry vacuum" left by the exclusion of GOD must be filled. "It becomes, therefore, anthropomorphic; it invests its own generalisation with personality. In this stage "the place of God is occupied by anthropomorphic personifications and unverifiable hypotheses."

The author presents, also, a very severe and just criticism of Dr.

\* *Religion a Revelation and a Rule of Life*. By REV. WILLIAM KIRKUS, M.A., LL.B., Rector of the Church of S. Michael and All Angels, Baltimore, Md. New York: Thomas Whittaker.

Maudsley's *Natural Causes and Supernatural Seemings*, exhibiting its utter want of logic, its many absurdities, and unmeaning bombast, in a very felicitous and amusing manner.

The study of ritual, not merely as a historical fact, but in its underlying principles, and in its practical influence, is engaging more and more the attention of religiously minded men. We have before us a recent publication on the *Philosophy of Ritual*,\* which aims at gathering "into a consecutive series of arguments the consideration and thoughts which sustain Ritual, and to attempt to discover the underlying principles and inherent concordances in nature which justify and enforce it."

The author defines Ritual as "a system of observances which addresses the imagination, memory, and feelings through the senses, by a connective order or ceremonial, or by structure, as buildings, etc., all intended to commemorate or reproduce events, to arouse or express proper feelings, or to illustrate an idea or belief in reference to special ends." The author, therefore, finds three principles involved in Ritual: 1. Art decoration. 2. Symbolism. 3. Commemoration.

The origin of Ritual the author finds not in chance nor device, but from "a constitutional inherent necessity in men to express their feelings in an outward sensible form. The need felt of Ritual, which in its logical origin is instinctive, through accident or desire may largely influence its subsequent growth."

This treatise presents a very full and logical discussion of the whole subject of Ritual. It is marked by candor and a reasonable common sense, while defending the use and insisting upon the value of Ritual ceremony even of a high and complex character.

The explanation of the Ritual of the Greek and Roman Churches, and even of the Irvingites, though quite elaborate, is full of interest, but we think the author has gone rather farther into detail in describing heathen Ritual, especially among the degraded races, than the full discussion of his subject required. It is, however, perhaps a fault on the right side, although it may to some readers make that chapter a little tedious.

Spiritualism has become a growing influence in the country for some years back, and men of calm minds have been waiting to see what its developments might indicate. Many have fallen under the dominion of this theory, and we have been forced to ask ourselves whether any part of its manifestations are of serious importance as arguments in the question of supernaturalism. A bequest was made by the late Henry Seybert to the University of Pennsylvania, subject to the condition that a commission be appointed to investigate, among

\* *Philosophy of Ritual*. *Apologia pro Ritu*. By L. F. GRATACAP, A. M. New York: James Pott & Co.

other systems, that of Modern Spiritualism, in which during his lifetime he had been known as an enthusiastic believer. A report of these investigations lies now before us.\* Following upon it is a detailed account of attendance at many seances, where materialisation, slate-writing, and the reading of closed, *i. e.* sealed letters, are in turn exhibited. The Commission complain of the high price charged by the several mediums for the opportunities afforded of testing their powers. All who have any doubt about the reality or unreality of Modern Spiritualism will have their doubts put finally to rest by a perusal of the Seybert Report. According to the sentence, passed after long and patient inquiry, sifting of evidence, and witnessing of manifestations, what is called Modern Spiritualism is a disgusting and venal system of imposition and fraud. As this is only the Preliminary Report, it is fair to spiritualists to say that they may, in the process of further investigations, have an opportunity of disproving the conclusion of the present Commission. There is much that is highly amusing in the book, particularly in the interview of one of the Commission with a so-called materialised spirit, to whom he plays the part of former lover. The spirit (?) acknowledges recollecting as part of their former common experience the incident of the dagger and the bowl. She answers also to the name of Rosamund, recognising, moreover, Eleanor as a recent acquaintance. But perhaps spirits will answer to any name you choose to call them, and fool the caller to the "top of his bent."

\* *Preliminary Report of the Commission appointed by the University of Pennsylvania to investigate Modern Spiritualism in Accordance with the Request of the late Henry Seybert.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

## German Contemporary Literature.

---

SPEAKING of the books by which he has been influenced most, a well-known English writer reminds his readers of an old lady who once remarked with a self-satisfied air that "she would never allow herself to be converted by such a low fellow as Richard Weaver, or any one like him. If she did get converted, she would take care to have as her spiritual guide Dr. Guthrie or — the Bible itself." We all laughed at her, the writer continues, but the old lady was in earnest, and in fact, she was not mistaken, though Dr. Guthrie himself did not convert her. She heard the famous Scotch preacher, who in his sermons showed her the way to the greatest and most influential teacher of mankind, the Bible. There are, indeed, many among us who deny this greatest of all influences, lowering the sacred books to mere historical documents, or antiquated forms of religious speculation, denouncing them as valueless for our generation, and not suited to the spiritual wants of our age. The deeper this opinion is rooted in literary and so-called cultivated writers the more we will welcome Dr. Sanders's new book,\* which this eminent scholar, our first authority on Old German research, intends to be "the basis of the popular, as well as the higher culture." In it the finest passages of the Bible, followed by those of the old classics, are given in the translation of known philologists, most of them being by Sanders himself, from whose pen we have Lamech's Song, the Blessing of Jacob and Isaac, the Psalm of the Children of Israel passing the Red Sea, the Song of Solomon, Psalm 137, Sappho's Prayer to Aphrodite, Dio Cassius' Report of Varus' Defeat and Death, Horace's Ode to Melpomene, and others, all of them translated with singular taste, and so powerfully recast that they do not lose the charm of the classical originals.

The publication of this work which thus appeals to the public at large is a signal improvement upon former days, when the general public in Germany simply declined to be offered books of this kind. The mere existence of the book, therefore, testifies that we are advancing in the right direction. On the other hand, the great impulse which the

\* *Fürs deutsche Haus. Blütenlese aus der Bibel und den mustergültigen griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern.* Von DANIEL SANDERS. Mit einem Lichtdruck von Wisnieski. Berlin: Rosenbaum.

critical studies on the Old and New Testaments have received at the hands of acute scholars has, in recent years, brought to light much important information, appealing not to the general public, but to the Christian reader and the theological scholar. Exegetical investigations are now encouraged here on every side; and when taken up by men of true learning, critical accomplishments, and devout scholarship, — men whose views are not biased by the tendency of an infallible school, — these studies cannot easily be overvalued. Until recently the works of our leading exegetical scholars were very difficult of access to the ordinary theological reader. It is owing to Dr. Zöckler, of Greifswald University, that this difficulty has been overcome. Himself a thorough scholar of positive and earnest views, an accomplished writer and impartial critic, Dr. Zöckler has undertaken to bring into the book market a comprehensive statement of the *present state of Biblical exegesis*. The Greifswald professor is the general editor; as a work of this comprehensive character could naturally not be accomplished by one man alone, Zöckler has secured the assistance of a number of competent scholars, nearly all of them professors in German and Swiss universities, and most of them well known in England and America; all are men of sound positive views, who, while declining to accept every "result" of newest criticism as infallible truth, have for their learning and scientific reputation the confidence of all those who do not wish the Holy Scriptures to be made the object of critical sport and subtleties. Dr. Klostermann of Kiel, Luthardt of Leipzig, Kübel of Tübingen, Nösgen of Rostock, Von Orelli of Basel, Ötli of Bern, Schultz of Breslau, Strack of Berlin, and others coöperate. Although the work starts from the presupposition that criticism and free research are necessary for, and the sole guaranty of, true scientific progress, the names of Dr. Zöckler's helpers show that the whole undertaking is based on the principles of the positive orthodox school of German theology. The present time, Dr. Zöckler thinks, is well suited to give, in a sort of Exegetical Encyclopædia, an account of the exegetical results which during the last twenty years have been arrived at. The *Bibelwerke* of De Wette, Gerlach, Grau, Vilmar, Daibsel, Hirzel, are more or less antiquated; others, as Kiel, Delitzsch, Meyer, Hoffmann, who all go into the captious intricate details of linguistic matters, do not meet the requirements of our busy time. A commentary of the whole Bible is wanted, which is based on the solid results of the latest research, and which at the same time procures in a short compass a continuous explanation of the sacred books. The *Kurzgefasster Kommentar*\* is intended in the first place for clergy-

\* *Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments, sowie zu den Apokryphen.* Unter Mitwirkung von Burger, Klostermann, Kübel, Luthardt, Nösgen, v. Orelli, Ötli, Schnedermann, Schultz herausgegeben von D. H. STRACK und D. O. ZÜCKLER. Nördlingen: Beck, 1886 and 1887.

men who, for obvious reasons, are not able to procure for their libraries all those works of special study which represent the progress of theological thought; in the new Commentary they have the results of newest research put into their hands in such a practical manner that the reader is saved the necessity of going minutely through the complicated reasonings of special works. In the second place the student of theology will profit by it, being enabled to study in a comparatively easy manner and short time the Holy Scriptures in their entirety and their inner connection. The Commentary will be also of value to all laymen of a higher culture who are desirous to obtain a deeper insight into the Divine Book. These few remarks on the intrinsic value and purport of the new book must suffice.

Turning to the manner in which Dr. Zöckler's plan has been executed, I would mention that the principal part of the work is a verbal and accurate translation, accompanied by philological, critical, and archæological explanations, while the summaries of the passages and the connexion of thought is given in continuous discussions, either preceding or following the translation; bibliographical notices and directions of a literary and critical kind are given wherever an opportunity offers itself, in order to enable those who may wish to go more thoroughly into any of the numerous questions of text criticism or any exegetical problem to know what has been written on the respective passages, and to assist them in forming for themselves a clear judgment on their literal meaning. The whole work has been divided into two departments, of which Professor D. Strack of Berlin and Dr. Zöckler are the respective editors, the former having undertaken the general editorship of the Old, the latter of the New Testament. Of the Old, the fourth part, containing *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*, has just been published by Professor von Orelli of Basel; of the New Testament, divided into four parts, the two first instalments were published in 1886: the three Synoptical Gospels, by Professor Nösgen of Rostock, and the Gospel according to S. John, by the well-known Dr. Luthardt of Leipzig. Space will not permit me to make the volumes already published the subject of a close critical examination and lengthy review; all that can be said of them is that the programme of the whole has been executed in a most successful manner; the volume prepared by Luthardt is a model for work of this kind, conveying in concise language, and within a very short compass, a clear idea of the critical problems of the Gospel, of the numerous hypotheses connected with it, and giving his own positive opinion on it in a convincing manner. If we consider the nearly unanimous approval the new Commentary has, with only very few exceptions,\*

\* Attacks upon the work have been made by the new critical school of Giessen and Strassburg. With reference to them I would draw the attention of our readers

received from our theological reviews, and take into account its great sale, Dr. Zöckler has very successfully come forward to fill up the gap which our theological and exegetical literature was suffering from. We therefore very cordially welcome this standard work, which is the fruit of devout as well as of ripe scholarship.

In the second third of this century we had a man whose exegetical works in some respects may be compared with these new discussions,—a man of great linguistic attainments and singular devotion, whose New Testament commentaries are still in use, and who himself may be known to many of your American readers. The biography \* of this excellent man, Dr. Tholuck, the *Studentenwater of Halle* has just been completed by the publication of the second volume. For the execution of his work Dr. Witte had access to the archives of the Prussian ministries as well as of the two universities whose ornament Tholuck became in the course of time; richer sources, however, were opened to him through the professor's widow, "Frau Rat," who intrusted him with private correspondence and family papers. If in the first volume, in which Tholuck's youth, his life at school (where the wonderful linguistic gifts of the boy made him a sort of "Wunderkind"), and the beginnings of his university career are told, the editor in some of his chapters has suffered from the excess of his materials, and frequently overburdens his readers with minor details, the second volume is free from this drawback. Divided into nine chapters it begins with Tholuck's removal from Berlin to Halle. "Gehen Sie," the great Hegel then said to Tholuck, when he paid him his last visit, "und bringen Sie dem alten Hallenser Rationalismus ein Pereat." A life of religious difficulties and academical struggles, thus prophesied by the great philosopher of Berlin, opens before the young professor at Halle. The first three chapters of the volume introduce the reader into the midst of the strife. New Beginning, New Work, New Struggles, are the headings of the first chapters; then follows "Tholuck in Rome," where Bunsen and his friends receive the young rising academician into their congenial society, and the description of the hot "Hallesche Streit," which purifies the religious atmosphere of the university. "New literary Storms" ensue, but in all these literary discussions the final triumph is on Tholuck's side, who fully justifies the expectations put on his

to a short, excellent pamphlet written by the Editor of the Commentary (*Wider die unfehlbare Wissenschaft. Eine Schuttschrift für konservativer Forrschen und Lehren. Von D. O. ZÖCKLER. Nördlingen: Beck, 1887*), which shows Dr. Zöckler at his best. All the objections raised by Schürer and Holtzmann are here most successfully met, the illusion of the critical infallibility and the tendencies of the school having been laid bare in a masterly manner.

\* *Das Leben D. Fr. Aug. Gottgetreu Tholuck, dargestellt vom L. WITTE. Mit 2 Bildern von Th. aus den Jahren 1825 und 1872. Zwei Bänder. Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing.*

genius and manly power by the great Hegel. The sixth and seventh chapters relate his University Preaching and Pastoral Work, his second marriage with the young lady who, under the name of "Frau Rat," will be in loving memory of many of your readers, while the interest of the last chapters centres in Tholuck's Travels and his "Last Journey," the illness and parting of the great and pious man, who at last "reaches the flock of the Good Shepherd," and in the light of eternity is penetrating "the riddle of his own life." He once said of himself: "Vom Rätsel meines Wesens That mancher Silben lesen ; Des ganzen Wortes Fülle Bewahr ich in der Stille."

A German scholar writing a history of Ireland\* after Samuel Gardiner, Lecky, and Miss Hickson's English scholarship, even if judged by the scientific standard of history which the works of Ranke, the master of historical research, exhibit, has done much to promote a more careful study of Irish affairs, and, with the help of its method, has arrived at valuable results ; nevertheless Hassenkamp's history of the island, though not equal to Gardiner and Lecky in original research and fulness of matter, has its peculiar merit. We had in the German language as the best and trustful account of Irish history Lapenberg's articles in Eosch and Gruber's *Encyklopædia* (1845). Since that time new first-rate sources have been opened, which enabled the historian to discover the many powerful undercurrents that have been at work in Ireland since, with the Reformation, a new epoch in Irish history commenced. The new history, though not first-rate work as to brilliancy of style, possesses the more solid merit of being an impartial and reliable account of the relations between England and Ireland. The debatable ground of the nineteenth century politics is not entered into ; Hassenkamp prefers to write history instead of fallible political speculations. The reassertion of English supremacy in Ireland, under Henry VIII ; the establishment of an Anglican hierarchy, its influence on the nation ; the system of colonisation begun under Mary, and adopted by James as the best means for settling the Irish question ; the sufferings of the Roman Catholics of the island and their religious disabilities, are well told. Dr. Hassenkamp takes great pains to show that the religious difficulty came to the foreground the moment when the Puritans began to attain to a dominant position in the government of England ; at the bottom of the whole movement, Dr. Hassenkamp successfully shows from the best and original sources, were the priest in the confessional and the Jesuits, whose evil influences roused the feelings of the Irish population against their Protestant persecutors. In the sketch of the eighteenth century, the salient points of English politics are described in a true historical manner and judicious

\* *Geschichte Irlands von der Reformation bis zu seiner Union mit England.* Von Dr. R. HASSENKAMP. Leipzig.

tone, which well contrasts with the passionate language of those who consider it their literary task not to investigate historical truth, but to rouse political passion and bitterness.\* There is a historical school now rising in Germany, the tendency of which is in the very same direction. Johannes Jansen, a Roman Catholic, is its head. With the help of contemporary witnesses he tries to show that the reformation of Luther and Calvin are the sources of all the mischief Germany and North Europe has met with since the "glorious Middle Ages." Luther and his friends are a vulgar set of people, miscreants and scoundrels; all that is noble in art, science, education, national life, and literature is to be found on the side of Rome, while selfishness and immorality have their stronghold in Wittenberg, Zurich, and Geneva. Now the school begins to reclaim the artists of the Reformation period for Rome.

Kaufmann,† following his great master, endeavors to show that the genius of Dürer, the well-known painter of Nuremberg, found its true and congenial home in the "bosom of the Romish Church." From its very beginning this undertaking could not, in the face of all historical facts, hope for success. In the book mentioned in the second place, Zucker attacks the Roman Catholic art critic with arguments so powerful and stringent that the party from which the first blow originated in all earnest will be obliged to pass over the question at issue in silence. Thank God, there are still left in Germany, in Roman Catholic as well as in Protestant circles, a good many persons who in investigating historical truth will not suffer themselves to be imposed upon by denominational prejudices. It is truly refreshing to see in what sedate and at once learned manner Zucker follows up the intricate and surreptitious ways of his opponent, and how miserably the whole design breaks down before his victorious blows. The argumentation that the well-known pictures of the Apostles now preserved at Munich must be the work of a master whose heart and hand sympathised with the Reformation movement is masterly done. For this piece of evidence, alone, all friends of Dürer himself and of the history of art owe to the author their best thanks.

RUDOLPH BUDDENSIEG.

\* This reproach must be made to two new English publications relating the Irish history of the present century. Namely: *History of the Irish People*. Vol. II. The period from 1829 to the Land Act of 1881, by W. A. O'CONOR. London: 1887; and *Ireland since the Union*, by F. HUNTLY MCCARTHY. London: 1887.

† *Albrecht Dürer*. Von L. KAUFMANN. Freiburg i. B.: 1887. Herder. *Dürer's Stellung zur Reformation*. Von Dr. ZUCKER. Erlangen: 1887. Deichert.